

JOHANNES REMPE (1903-1977)

DE RHESO THRACUM HEROE (*On Rhesus as a Cult-Hero of the Thracians*), diss. Münster 1927  
English translation by David Armstrong.

*Where I have inserted something to explain a reference in the text, for example the dates of Darius I's reign: "founded by the Persians in the reign of Darius I (522-486 bc)," I have simply put it in parentheses in the text, as in this example. I have also raised a lot of Rempe's shorter footnotes to the text in parentheses, for example "Polyaenus...tells us (6.53)" p. 13, where Rempe gives this reference as a separate footnote. I have numbered the footnotes continuously rather than page by page. Rempe now and then uses line references to individual pages in addition to the page reference, an unusual practice, but I have left most of those in. In many cases I have indicated fuller titles of works he cites by abbreviation. —DA*

p.1 TITLE

De Rheso Thracum Heroe.  
Commentatio philologa,  
quam consensu et auctoritate  
amplissimi philosophorum physicorumque  
in alma litterarum universitate Wilhelmina-  
Westfala Monasteriensi ordinis  
ad summos in philosophia honores  
rite capessendos  
scripsit  
JOHANNES REMPE  
Rhenanus

On Rhesus, the Thracian Hero  
A Philological Dissertation  
which, by the consent and authority  
of the most excellent faculty  
of philosophy and science  
in the Wilhelmine-Westphalian  
University of Münster for  
the due attainment of the highest  
honors in philosophy, was written by  
JOHANNES REMPE  
Rhenanus

Monasterii Westfalarum  
Ex Officina Societatis Typographicae Westfaliae  
MDCCCCXXVII

Münster, Westphalia  
Westphalian Press  
1927

p. 2

In witness that this dissertation is to be printed by the consent and authority of  
the faculty of philosophy:

ARNOLD VON SALIS, Dean of Philosophy

This dissertation has been presented to the philosophy faculty for approval:

KARL MÜNSCHER, Professor

And subjected to a rigorous examination held on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of May 1926.

p. 3

Parentibus optimis sacrum

Dedicated to my excellent parents

p. 4 (blank)

p. 5

## PREFACE

Although Rhesus was a Thracian, according to all the ancient sources,<sup>1</sup> and many scholars of our own times have also considered this certain,<sup>2</sup> there are still those who have raised doubts about his origin, and tried to demonstrate that he was not originally a Thracian cult-hero.<sup>3</sup> Rather, they hold that the story of Rhesus, the Thracian hero, was invented by the author of the tenth book of the *Iliad*, and then expanded and altered by later writers who added new elements to his story and changed it. I have thought it all the more worth my time, and even necessary, to do the best I can to solve this learned controversy and settle what is the truth about the origins and history of the myth of Rhesus, because I had found that the greatest current authority on ancient mythology, Karl Robert,<sup>4</sup> gives an account of this matter which in my opinion cannot stand.

In treating this topic, I have arranged my material as follows. In the first chapter, I have left the extant tragedy *Rhesus*, which has come down to us along with the tragedies of Euripides,<sup>5</sup> completely aside,<sup>6</sup> and relied instead only on the remaining *testimonia* to demonstrate that there was, indeed, a Thracian cult-hero Rhesus.

p. 6

In the second, I have investigated what more the *Rhesus* can tell us, the most difficult and most important question being who first made Rhesus' mother a Muse. In the third, I have tried to explain how it came about that Rhesus was said to have been defeated and killed by Diomedes, and the true nature of the character Rhesus himself. And in the fourth and last chapter, I give a brief outline of the history of Rhesus, the cult-hero of Thrace, and show how his story was expanded with new additions by later writers.

## CHAPTER ONE

In reviewing the passages in which the hero Rhesus is mentioned, one must of course begin from Homer,<sup>7</sup> who says that Rhesus, king of the Thracians,<sup>8</sup> was the son of Eioneus. Now, the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* K (10) 435, Hipponax fr. 41 Diehl (=72 Loeb text) (T1); [Euripides] *Rhesus* 276ff, 303, 651, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1884, 27,15; Hiller v. Gaertringen, *De Graecorum Fabulis ad Thracas pertinentes*, Berlin 1886, (80-)83 (the *Epimetrum de Rheso*); Jessen, in Roscher (=Ro.), *Ausführliche Lexicon der Gr. u. Röm. Mythologie*, Leipzig 1884-1904 IV, 99; Sittig, *Pauly-Wissowa* (=PW) I. A 625; W. H. Porter, *The Rhesus of Euripides*, Cambridge 1916, xv; etc.

<sup>3</sup> Leaf, "Rhesos of Thrace," JHS 35, 1915, 1-11; Preller-Robert-Kern, *Griechische Mythologie*, (=Gr. Myth) Berlin 1894-1926, II, 1167-73; cf. Cauer, *BPW* 36, 1916, 810; Dahms, *Ilias und Achilleis*, Berlin 1924, 37.

<sup>4</sup> *Gr. Myth.*, II 1167-73.

<sup>5</sup> Wilamowitz, who thought that the tragedy was a product of the 4<sup>th</sup> century b.c. (*Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*, Berlin 1907, 11; *Griechische Verskunst*, 371,2) seems to me to have judged more rightly than those who have tried to make Euripides its author.

<sup>6</sup> I reserve the play till later, as Leaf argued that Rhesus was first believed to be a Thracian hero by the author of the *Rhesus*, or if earlier, because of an oracle given the Athenians in 437-6 bc (when they founded Amphipolis), on which see p. 13 below. That this is not so will be perfectly apparent, when I have demonstrated, without any reference to the tragedy, that Rhesus was a true Thracian. Of the writings on this subject written in the wake of Porter's edition, I would cite "The Problem of the *Rhesus*," Richards, CQ 10, 1916, 192-197; "The *Rhesus*," Pearson, CR 35, 1921, 52-62.

<sup>7</sup> First in *Iliad* 10.435, cf. T1).

<sup>8</sup> Leaf claims that Homer called Thrace nothing but the region in the North bordering on the Hellespont. Porter (xxvii) rightly cites *Iliad* 14. 225-7, where Hera, leaving Olympus, went across Pieria and Emathia, then over the

city of Eion had been situated on the left bank of the Strymon, where it meets the Aegean Sea, near where the much later city of Amphipolis was founded (by the Athenians in 437/6 bc). This city of the Eioneans, Oberhummer<sup>9</sup> says, was founded by the Persians in the reign of Darius I (522-486 bc), following Eduard Mayer,<sup>10</sup> who argued that the Persians established many fortress towns on the northern shore of the Aegean, naming Doriscus near the mouth of the Hebrus and Eion at the mouth of the Strymon among them. But though one can establish from Herodotus<sup>11</sup> that Doriscus was indeed a Persian foundation, there is no reason not to think that already, even before Darius' times, there existed a Greek colony where later the city of Eion was located.<sup>12</sup> Indeed,

p. 7

I think it is probable that, as Kiepert<sup>13</sup> already had argued, the Ionian colonists had at first called the region at the mouth of the Strymon the *eiôn*, the beach. And then that name was given to a city they later founded. Rhesus' father 'Eioneus' was therefore an eponymous hero-founder of that city, as Wilamowitz<sup>14</sup> first conjectured. Many scholars since have agreed: I could mention Hiller v. Gaertringen, Robert, Perdrizet, and Sittig.<sup>15</sup> But perhaps, one might suspect, the Greeks first called *the river itself* "the river at the beach," *eiôneus*, (so that Rhesus' father was a river-god, Strymon,) before they adopted the Phrygian name<sup>16</sup> "Strymon;" especially since Conon (T2) follows the tradition that the river Strymon was once called "Eioneus." But that means it is necessary for us to examine whether Conon's tradition was true<sup>17</sup> or false,<sup>18</sup> and to inquire what authority Conon was following in the fourth of his *Mythological Narrations*, a book that he dedicated to Archelaus Philopator (or Philopatris, king of Cappadocia 36 bc-10 ad, author of scholarly geographical works. We have these narratives only as abridged by the 9<sup>th</sup> century Byzantine patriarch Photius, who read and summarized for his circle's benefit a number of pagan prose authors, many now lost, in his *Bibliotheca*.)

---

'snowy mountains of the Thracians' to Athos, and then over the sea, before she came to Lemnos. It cannot be doubted that Homer meant by the 'snowy mountains of the Thracians' the region round the peninsula of Chalcidice. By the earlier Greeks the whole region on the northern shores of the Aegean was called 'Thrace,' and was thought to have been inhabited by the various Thracian peoples since early times. See Strabo, 7. 329, 11; 330, 24; 331,36; 10. 471, 17; Kiepert, *Lehrbuch der alten Geographie*, Berlin 1878, 307ff, 320; Tomaschek, 'Die alten Thraker,' *Sitzungsbericht Wien. Ak. Wiss.* 128 (1893), fasc. IV; Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen 1896.171-243.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Thuc. 4.102.4; Oberhummer *PW* V, col. 2116.

<sup>10</sup> *Gesch. Alt.* III 172.

<sup>11</sup> 7. 59. Busolt *Gr. Gesch.* II 529 says cautiously that it was a fortress in the plains *around* Doriscus.

<sup>12</sup> Herodotus 5. 2, 10; 7.25, 107, 113; 8. 118, 120; Busolt, II.637.

<sup>13</sup> Kiepert, *cit.* 315.

<sup>14</sup> *Hom. Unt.* 27,15; 413.

<sup>15</sup> Hiller, *cit.* 80; Wilamowitz *Studien z. Ilias*, Berlin 1901, 502; a different interpretation is offered at Robert *Gr. Myth.* II 1169; Perdrizet, *Cultes et Mythes du Pangée, Annales de l'Est.* Année 242, fasc 1, Paris 1910, 14; Sittig, *PW* 1 A col. 625.

<sup>16</sup> Hiller, 80.

<sup>17</sup> As Porter (xv) argued.

<sup>18</sup> Leaf (1 note 1) thinks that Conon invented this tradition, in order to reconcile the evidence in Homer with the tragedy: cf. Sittig, *PW* 1 A 625.

Now, Ulrich Hoefer<sup>19</sup> had argued that Conon's work was based principally on three authorities, Ephorus; Hegesippus of Micybernae (in Thrace); and a third *auctor incertus* who had written a digest of various works on mythology. And he ascribed Conon's *Narrations* 10, 32, 46, 13, 4, 20, 7, and 17, (which have connections with Thracian history and mythology), to Hegesippus, whose floruit was probably in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century bc or thereabouts.<sup>20</sup> And yet it has been doubted by some<sup>21</sup> that Hegesippus was Conon's source; though E. Schwartz held<sup>22</sup> that Hoefer's arguments for this are excellent. Hoefer began his arguments for Hegesippus as Conon's source for (eight of) his stories from *Narrations* 10. He claims that this was taken from Hegesippus' *Palleniaca* (a local history of the peninsula of Pallene in Chalcidice). Because in the version of Parthenius 6, which gives nearly the same story about Pallene (T2),

p. 8  
we find in the *codex Palatinus* of Parthenius the marginal note<sup>23</sup> "this story is told by Theagenes (of Rhegium, fl. ca 525 bc, mythographer and allegorist)<sup>24</sup> and by Hegesippus in his *Palleniaca*." And we learn also from (the topographical lexicon of) Stephanos of Byzantium (s.v. *Pallênê*) that Hegesippus, in this work, dealt with Pallene, the daughter of Sithon and wife of Clitus, and the eponymous heroine of the peninsula of Pallene in Thrace. Oder attempted to refute Hoefer's argument, on the grounds that, in various details, Parthenius' and Conon's surviving versions differ so greatly that it would seem most improbable that they come from the same source. First, the reason why Sithon gave up fighting the suitors himself,<sup>25</sup> then the means by which Aphrodite rescued Pallene from death; both are explained in a different and incompatible way by Parthenius and Conon. And even more remarkable is the fact that Parthenius calls Sithon the king of the Odomantes that live beyond the Strymon on Mt. Pangaeus, but Conon calls him the king of Pallene. Also, there is a difference between the story of the city's founding in general that Conon tells and the love-narrative as Parthenius gives it.

But in comparing these two narratives, first, one must keep in mind that since we are reading Conon's story as the patriarch Photius abridged it, it could easily be that some details are left out. Also, Conon was more interested in telling whatever pertained to the history and genealogy of both the peninsula of Pallene and the heroine Pallene; Parthenius, in telling only what concerned Pallene's love-story. But what we actually have as a story is not so different in each that we need to postulate two different sources. For the fact that Sithon is said by Conon to be king of the Thracian Chersonesus--i.e. the peninsula of Pallene<sup>26</sup>-- but by Parthenius, king of the Odomantes instead, needs to be considered further. Because the peninsula of Pallene was inhabited by the Sithones,<sup>27</sup> who were descended from the Edones; and the Odomantes

<sup>19</sup> Conon, *Narrationes*, ed. U. Hoefer, Greifswald 1890 (at <https://archive.org/details/kononnarratione00conogoog/page/n12>), 107.

<sup>20</sup> Jacoby *PW* VII col. 2611, 9ff.

<sup>21</sup> Oder, *Wochenschrift für klass. Philol.* 7, 1890, 512 ff; Jacoby, *PW* VII col. 2010; *Fragmenta Gr. Hist.* 1.499.

<sup>22</sup> Schwarz, *Hermes* 35 1900, 129, 6.

<sup>23</sup> On the credibility of these marginal notes see p. 17 below.

<sup>24</sup> "Diogenes" MS: "Theagenes" Gale, ed. Paris 1675.

<sup>25</sup> There is a typographical error in Oder's text here and in the following pages (Clitus is put in the place of Sithon and vice versa), unless we are to think it was Oder's fault.

<sup>26</sup> Strabo 7. 330, 25; Steph. Byz. s.v. Παλλήνη.

<sup>27</sup> Tomaschek, *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Phil.-Hist. Classe, 130, *Die Alten Thraker, Ein Ethnologische Untersuchung*, Wien 1893, I. 37.

were related by descent to the Edones;<sup>28</sup> but the Edones from the earliest times held the region between the lower Axios river and the mouth of the Hebrus.<sup>29</sup> So it could easily be that some writer called the Sithonians “Odomantes,” and it seems not improbable that he thought Sithon was king both of the Sithones

p. 9

and the Odomantes. Or perhaps Conon, one might think, called the whole Thracian Chersonesus “the land of the Odomantes”, as the scholiast of Aeschines 2.31 assumes that the region round the Ennea Hodoi—that is, Amphipolis—could be called “the Chersonesus” in his own day.

Now, the reason why king Sithon first fought with his daughter’s suitors himself hand to hand, and then bade them fight each other, is the same in both Parthenius and Conon. For Parthenius tells us that Sithon first warded off his daughter’s marriage by requiring a contest with her father, himself, but when he got older (and weaker), he decided to allow the marriage, and required a contest between two suitors instead. Conon does not give any reason for the changed conditions for the marriage. Then, at first glance, the outcome of the two stories looks very different. In Parthenius (T2:) Aphrodite appeared in a night vision to all the people, (to save Pallene from Sithon’s anger: she had fixed the fight in favor of the suitor she liked better, and he was going to burn his daughter on the defeated suitor’s pyre). In Conon, (T3), the pyre of the defeated suitor was extinguished in a great downpour. But perhaps, in the book which they used as a common source (Hegesippus), it may have been that Aphrodite, seen by both the people and their king in a night vision, showed them that the pyre if lighted would be extinguished by a great downpour, and the two writers have given a slightly inaccurate rendering of the same source. So, since Conon 10 and Parthenius 6 are not after all so different that they cannot be from the same source, I would say that Hoefer’s theory about the source of the two stories being the same is correct (it is Hegesippus). As for Conon 32 (T4), which completes the story told in Conon 6, Oder himself follows Hoefer (and accepts that Hegesippus is the source).<sup>30</sup> But in the cases of Conon 46 (Aeneas and Anchises), and 17 (a Thessalian myth), Oder<sup>31</sup> rightly refuses to accept them as being fragments of Hegesippus’ *Palleniaca*. As for the rest of the *narrationes* of Conon that Hoefer attributed to Hegesippus, Oder says<sup>32</sup> “if one accepts it as established that some of Conon’s abridgements are from Hegesippus, then one might also with a certain amount of probability ascribe some of the other local myths concerning Pallene to the same source, for example 13, and 4 (T5), and 20.”

I cannot accept the thesis of Martini,<sup>33</sup> that Conon, given that (as Photius says) he had composed his ‘narrations’ in the language and with the rhetorical figures of the writers we call “Attic, made but little use of older authorities. Because even if Conon did make the Attic rhetoricians his model, why should he not have researched diligently into all sorts of earlier

---

<sup>28</sup> Tomaschek. I. 39f.

<sup>29</sup> Tomaschek, I. 33.

<sup>30</sup> Oder 514, cf. Hoefer 59ff.

<sup>31</sup> Hoefer 59-68.

<sup>32</sup> Oder 515.

<sup>33</sup> *PW* XI cols. 1336 f.

texts? Particularly since Photius had claimed exactly that, (that Conon read widely to find his sources,)<sup>34</sup>.

p. 10

and since Martini gives such great value to Photius' judgment of Conon's style.

And therefore, if we sum up our arguments about the source of Conon 4, we can conclude as follows: since in some of his narratives (that concern Thracian subjects) it seems quite certain that Conon used Hegesippus of Micybernae as his authority, it becomes all the more probable that he followed him here too, because the story is a tradition that can only have been current in Pallene, and this material could not have been made up by Conon. And since Hegesippus, who clearly was either born at Micybernae or lived there, is allowed to have been a valuable authority on whatever concerned Chalcidice and the surrounding territory, (and on Thrace in general,) what Conon hands down as the tradition about Rhesus and Strymon is not to be dismissed lightly. Now in the Photius excerpt here is what we have:

"Olynthus: this narrative tells us the tradition about the city of Olynthus, and Strymon, who came to be the king of the Thracians, and whose name was given to the local river, which had once been called Eiôneus. And that he had three sons, Brangas, Rhessos (*sic*) and Olynthus. And Rhessos, having gone to Troy to join the army of Priam, was killed by the hand of Diomedes. Olynthus, having volunteered to battle with a lion in some hunting episode, was killed, and Brangas, his brother, having mourned his ill-fortune with much grief, buried him in the place he died, and then, coming to Sithonia, founded a large and prosperous city there, naming it Olynthus in memory of the boy."

But this is our only witness to Brangas, and Olynthus was said by other writers<sup>35</sup> to be the son of Heracles and Bolbe. But do not doubt Conon's word, for all that, for it is far more probable that the Greeks, after they had colonized Chalcidice, claimed that Hercules was the father of the eponymous hero of Olynthus, than that Hegesippus made up a family tree for Olynthus out of his own imagination.<sup>36</sup> Indeed this whole tale of Conon's has the stamp

p. 11

and color that marks it as one that you might well judge to have been the real tradition of the places in which it is located. And therefore it seems to be of great importance that, in Conon's story also, Rhesus is made to be related to Strymon, who, we should not be surprised, is called 'king of the Thracians,' since we learn that Strymon's cult was popular at Amphipolis from a surviving decree of 357/6 bc,<sup>37</sup> by which two men, Philo and Stratocles, who are exiled by the decree, have a tenth part of their confiscated property gifted to (the shrines of) Apollo and Strymon.

And so, to return to the question we started with, Conon *Narration 4* must come from Hegesippus' *Palleniaca*, including the claim that Strymon was "the eponymous hero of what

<sup>34</sup> Photius *Bibl.* 18 p. 130 b25=Fr. Gr. Hist. I 190, "there are contained in him narratives selected from many ancient authorities...and he is Attic in his style...."

<sup>35</sup> Hegesander ap. Athenaeus 8.334; Steph. Byz. s.v. "Olynthus."

<sup>36</sup> Both Tuempel (*PW* III 669) and Baege (*De Macedonum sacris*, Halle 1913, 196, 207) held that the myth that Hercules was Olynthus' father was later than the one that assigned this role to Strymon.

<sup>37</sup> CIG 2008 = Dittenberger Syll.<sup>2</sup>194.

had once been called the river Eiôneus,” in my opinion. Because it is not plausible that Conon, or Photius, added these words on their own; for both of them were of a later date than to have known for themselves that the Strymon had once been called the Eiôneus. If this was the tradition found in Hegesippus, however, a very learned student of matters pertaining to the regions located around Chalcidice, it has every reason to be believed.

Now, if in Homer’s *Doloneia* Rhesus is called “the son of Eiôneus,” does that not show that the region at the mouth of the Strymon was familiar to its author? For in fact, the *Doloneia* is generally agreed to be from a later time than Homer’s, and Wilamowitz<sup>38</sup> considers it nearer the age of Archilochus (c. 650 bc) than that of the earlier epic poets. The Greeks, when in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries bc they began sending out colonies to nearly all the shores of the Mediterranean,<sup>39</sup> had already had dealings with the inhabitants, most probably, of those regions before they sent the colonies. And therefore, the author of the *Doloneia* (supposing him to be a century or so later than Homer) could have known something about the territory at the mouth of the Strymon. So that poet, when he made Rhesus the son of Eiôneus, I would argue,

p. 12

had this very region in mind, whether he thought Rhesus was the son of the *city* of Eiôn’s eponymous hero, or of the hero of the *river* called Eiôn before “Strymon” became its name. And though I do not consider this established beyond doubt by the arguments I have set out, I consider it far more probable than the conclusion of other scholars that the name of the Eiôneus mentioned (as Rhesus’ father) in the *Doloneia* has somehow nothing to do with the Strymon or the region around that river; especially when we know from other sources that Rhesus’ name was well known to the inhabitants of that region.

And indeed Strabo, in the passage<sup>40</sup> in which he describes the region above the Strymon (that is, on the river’s left bank) on the sea and near Daton, as being the land of the Odomantes, Edoni, and Bisaltae, mentions that Rhesus had been made<sup>41</sup> their king.<sup>42</sup> That here Strabo’s authority is Homer<sup>43</sup> appears to me to be impossible; rather, I think it far more probable that he is following some other source, nor do we need to believe that the tragedy

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ilias und Homer*, Berlin 1916, 64.

<sup>39</sup> Pöhlmann, *Grundriss der Griechischen Geschichte*, Munich 1914, 22, pp. 42-45.

<sup>40</sup> 7. 331.36.

<sup>41</sup> Strabo’s words are “The Odomantes and Edoni and Bisaltae...among whom Rhesus ἐβασίλευε (aorist), became king.” We should not argue from the tense that Rhesus was not their native-born king, merely because βασιλεύω regularly takes the genitive—cf. Xen. Cyr. 5.4 “Cambyzes...who was king among the Persians,” Plato Rep. 473c, “if the philosophers βασιλεύωσιν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι, become kings in their cities.” We may question, however, whether this particular aorist ἐβασίλευε is meant to be ingressive (on which see the Stephanus (Étienne) *Thesaurus* II 168) or summary (treating the reign as an item in a list).

<sup>42</sup> Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Munich 1906, 213-14, with n. 19 (he etymologizes Rhesus as “prophet” following Suidas s.v. ῥησίαρχος) is wrong to make Rhesus the king only of the Bisaltes; Perdrizet, *Culte et Mythes du Pangée*, Paris-Nancy 1910, 13-14 and n. 3, corrects this.

<sup>43</sup> I mean by this, that Strabo was not following the *Doloneia*, *Iliad* 10.435, as cited above. For it could certainly happen that Strabo was following the evidence of some lost poem, when he said all this about Rhesus. If that is what happened. then my view is rather confirmed than challenged.

*Rhesus* was at hand for him (as a primary source), because neither Odomantes, nor Edones, nor Bisaltae are mentioned in it.

Now Marsyas the Younger<sup>44</sup> said in his *Macedonian Histories*<sup>45</sup> that on a certain hill in Amphipolis, there was a temple of Clio

p. 13

overlooking the sepulcher of Rhesus.<sup>46</sup> The temple and the sepulcher of Rhesus he describes were, we can well believe, either seen by him, or he followed good authority in describing them. Polyaeus, (a writer who lived during the reign of M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, 161-169 a.d, to whom he dedicates his *Stratagemata*), tells us (6.53) the following story. Hagnon the Athenian, the son of Nikias, when he was going to found a colony in the area which till then was called the Ennea Hodoi, and afterwards Amphipolis, was bidden by an oracle, whose words Polyaeus quotes, to transport the bones of Rhesus to his new city; and he only succeeded in his project when he had done this. And therefore, many scholars, Perdrizet, Leaf, Robert,<sup>47</sup> have held that the sepulcher of Rhesus that Marsyas describes was built by Hagnon also, and the cult of Rhesus at Amphipolis instituted, in 437/6. But before we subscribe to this theory, we need to ask whether Polyaeus' tradition is the truth.

Nearly everyone is agreed that Polyaeus is not a very trustworthy historian,<sup>48</sup> and deals with his material more as a rhetorician than a historian diligently researching the facts, including those very scholars who believe his story.<sup>49</sup> Now, Thucydides, the original inventor and prince of those who search tirelessly for truth and accuracy in composing history, who lived through the very events he describes, and who actually owned landed property near Amphipolis,<sup>50</sup> and was admiral of the Athenian navy sent to this region,<sup>51</sup> saved Eiôn from Brasidas, who was besieging it. Certainly he was *the* expert in the affairs of Amphipolis at this period, and wished to see the truth told about them, and therefore no one would doubt that the Athenians had set forth from Eiôn to found Amphipolis.<sup>52</sup> But Polyaeus claims that Hagnon, when the barbarians would not let him cross the Strymon, made a three days' truce, and then, crossing the Strymon at night, took the bones of Rhesus, and put them in a sepulcher, which he buried by the river, and surrounded and fortified. And then when the barbarians

---

<sup>44</sup> Whose place in history Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica*, Leipzig 1866, "De Marsyis Rerum Scriptoribus," I. 448-470, at 452 describes as follows: "Marsyas of Philippi, a priest of Hercules, first cited by writers in the days of Vespasian, Trajan and Hadrian, even if it is not clear how much later he lived than Marsyas of Pella, undoubtedly belonged to a period when the simple style of an earlier classical Greece had degenerated into displays of multiplex and various erudition and of research into mere details." (On the historians Marsyas of Pella, *FGH* 135, c. 356-294 b.c.--a relative of the great Antigonos I Monophthalmus, and as famous as a military man as a writer--and his lighter-weight namesake, Marsyas of Philippi, *FGH* 136, fl. c. perhaps ca. 150 b.c., cf. W. Heckel "Marsyas of Pella, Historian of Macedon," *Hermes* 108, 1980, 444-462. Both titled their major works *Macedonica*.)

<sup>45</sup> The title was restored by Schwartz, *Scholia Euripidea* II, Bonn 1887, 335-6, to the text of the scholion on *Rhesus* 346.

<sup>46</sup> Schol. *Rhes.* 346: "there is a temple of Clio in Amphipolis, built on a hill across from the tomb of Rhesus."

<sup>47</sup> Perdrizet *cit.* 15; Leaf 1915, 7; Robert *Gr. Myth.* II 1172-3.

<sup>48</sup> E.g. Münscher, *Xenophon in der griech.-röm. Litteratur*, Philologus Suppl. 13 1920, 136 f., Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II<sup>6</sup>, Munich 1924, 754.

<sup>49</sup> Rohde, *Psyche*, Tübingen-Leipzig 1903, I. 161, 1.

<sup>50</sup> Marcellinus, *vita Thucyd.* 19f, cf. Busolt III 620.

<sup>51</sup> 4.104; Busolt III 1145, 1153.

<sup>52</sup> 4.102



returned after three days, and complained that he had violated the truce, he replied that he had agreed on

p. 14

three days—but not *nights*. We must consider this fact first: if the Athenians set out *from Eiôn*—a fact we learn from Thucydides, whose veracity shines out all the more clearly, in that we can all agree that the Athenians set out from Eiôn, a town which they held as their trading post—there was no need for them to cross the Strymon (to get to Ennea Hodoi, soon to be called Amphipolis, which was 12 miles south). By this detail alone it can be shown that Polyaeus used a source that had not gone deeply into the historical context. And besides, so that I won't appear to be relying solely on Thucydides' silence to refute Polyaeus' account, the barbarians (Polyaeus claims) agreed to a truce with the soldiery of Athens, even though<sup>29</sup> years before (at the battle of Drabescus, 465 bc, when Athens had made its first effort to take over and colonize Ennea Hodoi, Thuc. 4.102), they had wiped out *ten thousand* Athenian soldiers. And this truce was supposedly agreed to by them for no other purpose than to give the Athenians a chance of burying the bones of Rhesus wrapped in a purple cloak and fortifying the grave with battlements. And after agreeing to this, the barbarians immediately went away and, after three days had passed, returned, at last, and only then saw what their enemy was doing. All this appears to me such a violation of probability as to be impossible to believe. Especially when it dawns on us that it was a ruse said in other sources to be one *of the Thracians' own*, by which, as Strabo<sup>53</sup> and Polyaeus himself<sup>54</sup> elsewhere claim, the Thracians deceived the Greeks, that is, to ask for a truce for a number of days and pretend that didn't include the nights—as Hiller von Gaertringen quite rightly pointed out (*cit.* 82, 53).

So, this must be our conclusion about the story in Polyaeus: it is what is called an aetiological fiction, invented for two reasons. First, a short story to show why Amphipolis was given that name. On that subject Melber's opinion that the name Amphipolis was chosen in memory of the ambiguity of the truce<sup>55</sup> is so unappealing that I might rather agree even with Wünsch<sup>56</sup> that "Amphipolis" meant the city built *around* (ἀμφί) the sepulcher of Rhesus. Thucydides (4. 102, T7), however, gives the true etymology (that the Strymon flows "around" both sides of it). Then, by means of this story, it can be explained why the sepulcher of Rhesus should be at Amphipolis, who, as all agree,<sup>57</sup> the Greeks believed was buried at Troy, because it was told in the *Doloneia* that he was killed

p. 15

by Diomedes near the city of Troy. So, they wondered how a sepulcher of Rhesus came to be built at Amphipolis and thought up an explanation. His bones were brought to Amphipolis by Hagnon, who, as one could know from Thucydides and many other writers after him, or from the inhabitants of Amphipolis themselves, was the first founder of the city. Since many other

---

<sup>53</sup> 9.401-2.

<sup>54</sup> 7.43, citing Ephorus as the source, cf. Hiller *cit.* 53.

<sup>55</sup> *cit.* 598.

<sup>56</sup> See Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*, Giessen 1909, part I, V 1, 198-199, with 730.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the funerary epigram from the *De peplo Aristotelis* (on which see Christ-Schmid I<sup>6</sup> 762), 56 Diehl: "Slain by sleep and weariness, here Rhesus lies,/for the Trojans have buried him here, on the Teucric beach."

heroes had similar stories told of them,<sup>58</sup> Polyaeus saw nothing incredible about this story, and he could well have believed the bones of Rhesus really had been brought there. So now that we have seen that the things Polyaeus hands down in *Stratagems* 6. 53 do not appear to be worthy of belief, there is good reason that Busolt, Hirschfeld, and Beloch<sup>59</sup> in discussing the foundation of Amphipolis simply discarded Polyaeus' account and were content to use Thucydides 4.102, and Diodorus 12.32.3, as their authorities. So then, all we can take home on Polyaeus' authority as true is the one thing about Rhesus's cult that was already known from Marsyas: that there was a hero-shrine and sepulcher of Rhesus at Amphipolis, even in later times.

And now that we have recognized that this shrine was *not* built by the Athenians when they founded their new city,<sup>60</sup> let's look around for evidence as to whether it was built entirely by Thracians, or by Greeks. And since the temple of Clio was situated on a hill opposite to it, perhaps you might suspect that the Greeks built both temple and sepulcher. But we will discuss the temple of Clio below,<sup>61</sup> and it's enough to state this only at the moment: even if the Greeks (and not the Thracians) had built the sepulcher of Rhesus, we still have to believe that he was already well known to the native Thracians. For that the Greeks, out of their own imagination, found a reason to connect Rhesus with Amphipolis is most unlikely, both *per se*, and for this same reason: that we know, from the *testimonia* we have reviewed, that this hero was already, and from the beginning, associated with the country round Amphipolis. So therefore, when we review the passages we have cited as a whole, we can take this for established fact: Rhesus was a Thracian born and bred, and a cult-hero of the Thracians themselves who dwelt in Amphipolis.

P. 16

We can now review the other places where the Rhesus tradition was kept alive. There is Hipponax (fr. 41 Diehl=71 Campbell), who says

...on chariots with Thracian white colts travelling,  
near the towers of Ilion, Rhesus  
was stripped of his armor, the king of the Aeneians.

Here Ten Brink<sup>62</sup> thought that for Αἰνεῖων (the people of Aeneia in Chalcidice) we should write Αἰνίων (the people of Aenus in northern Thrace), offering various parallels, in which the inhabitants of Ainus were indeed called the Αἰνίοι. He left out, however, the entry in Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. *Aineia*, "the adjective for a person from there is Αἰνεῖεύς." Thus, Hipponax would really be saying that they were from Aineia, at least if we can believe the scribes took that much care in writing the accents and distinguishing ι from εῖ. So it is uncertain<sup>63</sup> whether Hipponax intended Rhesus to be the chieftain of the Aeneians or the Aenii. The former was on

<sup>58</sup> Theseus' bones were brought to Athens, Plutarch *Cimon* 8, and Melanippus' from Thebes to Sicyon, Herodotus 5.67. Pfister (*cit.* 198 and 211) calls these tales also into doubt.

<sup>59</sup> Busolt *cit.* III 559; Hirschfeld *PW* I. col. 1950; Beloch *cit.* II 1<sup>2</sup>, 198.

<sup>60</sup> Of course, that the Athenians of later times could have done this is already ruled out, since (after Brasidas took the city in 424/5) it never came into their power again. Cf. Hirschfeld, *PW* I. col. 1951.

<sup>61</sup> P. 40 f.

<sup>62</sup> *Philologus* 6, 1851, 39.

<sup>63</sup> As Jessen (Ro. IV 108, 48ff) and Sittig (*PW* I A 629, 6) believe

the Thermaic Gulf, for Strabo<sup>64</sup> says that Thessalonica was founded by Cassander by uniting 26 towns, among which were Apollonia, Therma, Chalastra, Gareus, Aeneia and Cius; but Aenus was at the mouth of the Hebrus.<sup>65</sup> Leaf argues that Hipponax was thinking of Aenus,<sup>66</sup> and confirms that by citing Servius (on *Aeneid* 1. 469: "Rhesus was a king of Thrace, as some say the son of Mars, as others say the son of Hebrus or Strymon (the rivers), or of the Muse Euterpe"). Now when Servius tells us some authorities say Hebrus was the father of Rhesus, perhaps this went back to the authority of Hipponax himself and meant that Hipponax thought he was from Aenus. However that may be, certainly Hipponax took Rhesus to be a Thracian, and the king of a Thracian city or tribe.<sup>67</sup>

Now Parthenius 36 (T8) tells us that Rhesus, before he ever came to Troy, had wandered through many lands to make himself their ruler and exact tribute from their peoples. When he came to Cios (also called Prusa) in Bithynia, he encountered a beautiful princess named Arganthon. She was a great huntress.

p. 17

Rhesus fell deeply in love with her and married her; and later she tried to prevent him from going to Troy. When he was killed by Diomedes, in a river which was then given the name of Rhesus, and Arganthon heard of his death, she returned to Cios, where they had first become lovers, and wandered about in great grief, calling out Rhesus' name over and over, and finally died by refusing food and drink.

In the margin of the Codex Palatinus of Parthenius at 35, the previous tale, is found a note saying, "the story is told by Asclepiades of Myrlea in the first book of his *Bithyniaca*." Sakolowski<sup>68</sup> proved that these words should instead be at the head of 36. So the ascription is to a book by a celebrated Homeric scholar of the last two centuries bc,<sup>69</sup> and though the marginal ascriptions in Parthenius are not necessarily by the author himself, as Bethe thought,<sup>70</sup> they were certainly inserted by a learned student of literature and one worthy of credit.<sup>71</sup> And in this fable, Asclepiades' plot summary was itself probably taken from some poet of the Hellenistic age, I would think.

As for the story itself, no one will doubt that "Arganthon"<sup>72</sup> is a name taken from the mountain of Arganthon near Cios (Strabo, 12. 54); so that whether Rhesus was married by some poet, using his own invention, to its heroine Arganthon, or some noble house that migrated from Europe to Bithynia carried Rhesus' story there, is a difficult question, and solving

---

<sup>64</sup> Strabo 7. 21 and 24.

<sup>65</sup> Strabo 7a 1. 52.

<sup>66</sup> Leaf *cit.* p. 1.

<sup>67</sup> Kretschmer (185-6?) conjectured that there was some relation between the kings of Aeneas' lineage prophesied in *Iliad* 20. 306-308, *Hymn. Aph.* 196-7 and the names themselves "Aenaea" and "Aenus." There was certainly a cult of Aeneas at Aeneia (Baege 203-4).

<sup>68</sup> In his Teubner edition of Parthenius, Leipzig 1896, *prolegomena* xxv; and Martini in his Teubner edition of Parthenius, Leipzig 1902, p. 89 on story 35, agrees.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Christ-Schmid II<sup>6</sup> 430.

<sup>70</sup> Hermes 38, 1903, 608-617.

<sup>71</sup> Rohde, *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig 1900, 123 ff; Susemihl, *Geschichte der Gr. Litteratur in den Alexandrinerzeit*, Leipzig 1891, I 195 (and II, 1892, 15-19).

<sup>72</sup> Knaack (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1896, 868) compares this huntress' myth with that of Hylas.

it requires me to discuss briefly the relations between the inhabitants of Thrace and of northern Asia Minor.

For since, by the writers of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries bc, the Bithynians are frequently called "the Thracians" or "the Thracians in Asia,"<sup>73</sup> E. Meyer rightly argued that they kept to the language and manners of Thracians for centuries. We are told that the race itself of the Bithynians sprang from Thracian immigrants from European Thrace to Asia. Herodotus (7.75) p. 18

says that "this people, after crossing into Asia, took the name of Bithynians. Before, they had been called Strymonians, while they dwelt upon the Strymon; from which, according to their own account, they had been driven out by the Mysians and Teucrians." Again, he speaks of the great war of the Mysians and Teucrians, which was still earlier (than the Trojan War), in which these nations crossed the Bosphorus into Europe, and first conquered all Thrace, and then pressed forward till they came to the Ionian Sea, while to the south they reached as far as the river Peneus" (7.20). Again, at Herodotus 5.13, Xerxes asks two Paeonian youths to tell him where Paeonia was; and they answered that Paeonia was on the Strymon, but the Paeonians were colonists (ἀποίκους) from the Teucrians, who inhabited Troy. And indeed Tomaschek<sup>74</sup> showed it was not the Teucrians and the Mysians who expelled the inhabitants of the banks of the Strymon, on the grounds that a joint expedition by the Teucrians and Mysian *from Asia into* Europe could not have happened. For the Mysians came over *from* Europe, from the northern region, and occupied the Troad. But it is plausibly supposed that the Teucrians migrated into Asia from Cyprus.<sup>75</sup> Herodotus was in error, as Thraener, Tomaschek, and Kretschmer saw, in supposing the Teucrians and Mysians had migrated out of Asia into Europe, and Macan has accepted their conclusion.<sup>76</sup> So in Bithynia there were Thracians, who originally had lived in Thrace near the Strymon. Arrian (fr. 37, Müller FHG III 593) also claims the Thracians migrated from Europe into Asia, at the same time that the Cimmerians invaded Asia,<sup>77</sup> which was in the 7<sup>th</sup> century bc, as Kretschmer (211) and E. Meyer (G. A. I 2<sup>3</sup> p. 489) both hold.

But already, before these migrations of the Cimmerians and Bithynians, Thracians and Thraco-Phrygians<sup>78</sup> had crossed over into Asia. For in Bithynia, as it was later called, near the Bosphorus the Bebryces lived,<sup>79</sup> some of them dwelling near Lampsacus, others near Ephesus and Magnesia (Tomaschek I 34), and the Mygdones between Dascylium and Myrlea, the Doliones (I 35) between Rhyndacus

p. 19

---

<sup>73</sup> Thucydides 4. 75, Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.2; *Anab.* 6.2.17, 4.1, Ps.-Scylax *Periplus* 92, Ephorus *ap.* Diodorus 14.38: cf. E. Meyer, *PW* III 510.

<sup>74</sup> *cit.* 1.16.

<sup>75</sup> K, 190.

<sup>76</sup> Thraener, 324, 338; Tomaschek, 47, Kretschmer, 173, 211; Macan, *Herodotus: books 7-9*, London 1908, on 7.20.

<sup>77</sup> On the Cimmerians see Lehmann-Haupt *PW* XI 397ff.

<sup>78</sup> There is no doubt that the Thracians and Phrygians were closely related peoples, cf. Kretschmer 173f., Hirt, *Die Indogermanen* I, Strassburg 1905, 132.

<sup>79</sup> Tomaschek I 35, Meyer *PW* III 510.

and Aesepeus: their hero Dolion is said to have lived near Lake Ascanius (now Iznik) (Strabo 14. 681). Again, some of the Edones, as Aristotle<sup>80</sup> noted, lived at Antandrus before the migration of the Cimmerians. And even if we do not know at what dates all these various peoples had crossed over into Asia, that all of them migrated into Asia from Europe. Indeed, it has been established that the Phrygians had migrated all together from Europe into Asia;<sup>81</sup> so that in general this conclusion can be established:<sup>82</sup> Phrygian (or Thracio-Phrygian) people were driven out of Europe into Asia by the Illyrians, who had invaded in about the 13<sup>th</sup> century bc, and their migrations began then. As time went on, at what intervals we do not know,<sup>83</sup> other Phrygo-Thracians followed (Tomaschek I 147). And among these migrations of the Phrygians and Bithynians, we can establish that the Mysi also crossed over. So that the migration of the Thyni and Bithyni into Asia was the last act, apparently, of this drama of migration.

Now if the Phrygo-Thracian people have been shown to have migrated over a number of centuries into Asia, and the cult of Rhesus, which as we showed above (p. 15) still flourished in the valley of the Strymon itself, from which so many of the peoples had set forth, it seems probable that it was taken along by these peoples when they migrated. And this reasoning can be proven by the traces of Rhesus which we find in the very route by which these peoples migrated. For at Byzantium there is a place called "Rhesium," which Procopius (*On the buildings of Justinian* I. 4, 28) mentions as a *temenos* of St. Theodosius, and, as Preger (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 14, 1905, 274 and n.1) tried to show, also a Πόρτα Ῥησίου, a "Rhesian Gate." John of Antioch (fr. 24, 6, FHG IV 551) and Suidas (s.v. *Rhesos*) claimed that Rhesus had dwelt in the Rhesium which now belonged to the martyr St. Theodosius, and Suidas says that he was both a general "of the Byzantines" and was the Trojan ally who had died at Troy by the hands of Diomedes and Odysseus. So, this "Rhesium" is to be referred to Rhesus, and it is to be linked with the migrations of the Thracian peoples, whose native hero Rhesus was, from Europe into Asia,

p. 20

as various scholars have thought,<sup>84</sup> and I agree. In the same way, the river "Rhebas" which Pliny mentions (*NH* 5.124) as flowing into the Bosphorus, he notes was called by many the "Rhesus," and Solinus<sup>85</sup> agrees: he says, "On the shores of the Pontus just past the entrance to the Bosphorus *and the river Rhesus* the river Sagaris begins."

But there was another river in the Troas that was given the name of Rhesus. For Homer at *Iliad* 12.20-23 (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 340, Nonnus 3.193), listing the rivers that spring from Mt. Ida, calls them "*Rhesus* and Heptaporos, and Karesos and Rhodios, and Grenikos and bright Scamander, and Simois." But though later writers seem uncertain<sup>86</sup> which river Homer meant

<sup>80</sup> See Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. *Antandrus*, cf. Tomaschek I 39.

<sup>81</sup> Herodotus 7.73; Strabo 7. 330, 25, 295. 2; Tomaschek I 4, 28ff; Kretschmer 173; I 132; Meyer, G.A. I 2<sup>3</sup> 473.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Patsch, Ö. J. h. 1907, 174; U. Wilcken, *Gr. Geschichte*, Munich/Berlin 1924, 37.

<sup>83</sup> Kretschmer 187.

<sup>84</sup> Xanthus (*ap.* Strabo 14 680) preserves a tradition that the Phrygians after the Trojan War crossed over from Europe and the shores of Pontus. Cf. Thraemer 294, Kretschmer 186, Tomaschek I 47.

<sup>85</sup> 43.1; as Robert (*Gr. Myth.* II 1169, n. 8) notes, Solinus is following Pliny.

<sup>86</sup> Demetrius of Scepsis *ap.* Strabo 13.602, 44: "The Rhesus river is nowadays called Rhoetes, unless the one that flows into the Granicus is the Rhesus;" Eustathius on the *Iliad* 890,6, 889, 58; Pliny *NH* 5.124, on which Sittig 629, 39.

by the Rhesus, the river which flows into the Granicus from the lower side is probably the one mentioned in Homer, and thus. in the days of the author of the 12<sup>th</sup> book of the *Iliad*, it is evident that there was a river in the Troad named after Rhesus.<sup>87</sup>

This river in the Troad is (wrongly) identified by Robert (*Gr. Myth.* II 1169-70) as the oldest and the only, as one might say, native trace of the hero; and this proves to him that Rhesus was *not* really a Thracian, but a Trojan, who was a river-god—so that it is quite fitting that he had a father named from “shores,” Eioneus—and he fell in love with the mountain-nymph Arganthonē, because in wandering through neighboring lands with his troops—perhaps he was thought to be the king of the Troas itself—he came to Cios. Parthenius, therefore, (according to Robert) preserves an ancient myth which was well known in one certain place, Cios, but perfectly suitable for integration into the context of the *Iliad*. But the first question to ask here is whether the fact that Rhesus was the eponymous hero of a river in the Troad proves in any way that he was not a Thracian by origin, but rather a Trojan. For why should the Thracians (in the Troad), part of whom certainly came there from European Thrace,<sup>88</sup> not have called the river by his name? Then, Rhesus’ father’s name, Eioneus, should be interpreted as telling us he came from near the Strymon, as we have seen (p. 11f). And we have also shown p. 21

that Rhesus himself originally came from the region round the Strymon.

So in this part of our argument we must avail ourselves also of the passage in Appian (*Mithridatic Wars*, 1:1, T9) whose tradition is as follows. The Greeks are said to believe that the followers of Rhesus, that is, the Thracians who came to Troy with him, when their leader himself was slain at night by Diomedes, fled to the Bosphorus. The part of them that could not find ships took over the territory of the Bebrycians, in Bithynia; the other part, Byzantium, and settled in the territory of the so-called Bithyni who live near the river Bithya; but as they could not find food, they returned to Bebrycia, and called that territory after the river they had recently lived by, Bithynia. Or perhaps they just changed “Bebrycia” to “Bithynia” over the course of time by changing the pronunciation, which only differed a little anyway. Or that their first king was Bithys, son of Zeus and the nymph Thrakia, and that is how the name “Bithynia” came about in both these lands.<sup>89</sup> Now Thraemer quite rightly compares with Appian’s account the B scholion on *Iliad* 13.3, where lines 3-7 describe Zeus as

...himself turning his bright pair of eyes  
to distant lands, those of the Thracians, the horsemen,  
the Mysians, who fight hand-to-hand, the proud Hippêmolgi  
who drink mare’s milk, and the justice-loving Abii...

In this scholion, which comes from Porphyry and names him as source, it is said to be impossible that Zeus, looking out from Troy to the Mysians in Asia, could have seen European Thrace. But that problem is solved, by reasoning that the poet is not making Zeus look at Thrace itself, but the land *of Thracians*, that is, the Bithyni and Thyni, who though originally from Thrace live in Asia. Porphyry, the disciple of Plotinus, was following some grammarian who was

---

<sup>87</sup> Kiepert, *Atlas Antiquus*, map V C h; Sittig 629.

<sup>88</sup> Strabo 13. 586, Kretschmer 187.

<sup>89</sup> The other details in Appian do not seem worthy of much consideration, but it appears that at least this one detail preserves the tradition, a good one, that the Bithyni had migrated from Thracian Europe to Asia.

ignorant that the Mysi also had lived near European Thrace in the same places where the “Moesi” still lived in Roman times. So, he thought up this rationale: that the Bithyni, who actually migrated to Bithynia after Homer’s time, were the “Thracians” of the Homeric lines. And that theory was originally part of Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions*, as Thraemer showed (311ff). The same scholar

p. 22

added to this “solution of Porphyry’s,” as another fragment of his work, an account which in yet another Homeric scholion (schol. B on *Iliad* 2. 844) is given for the three different troops of Thracians mentioned in the poem. In the catalogue of the Trojan allies in book 2 Acamas is the leader of the “Thracians,” but these are inhabitants of the country round the city of Maroneia; Iphidamas (*Iliad* 11. 221-230), himself born in Thrace, is the leader of yet other Thracians; and Rhesus was the leader of those who were *peri Lydian*. But there, where Schrader<sup>90</sup> wrongly conjectured *peri ton Lydian*, Thraemer rightly conjectures *tôn peri Thunian*, Rhesus was “the leader of those in Thynia, the Thynians.” And I side with Thraemer in considering it likely that we should assign to this ‘solution’ of Porphyry’s the same tradition that, as we saw, Appian relies on at the opening of his *Mithridatic Wars*.

And therefore, since the connection between Rhesus’ Thracians and the Bithyni who migrated from Europe into Asia was probably some grammarian’s invention, I do not even assign great importance to the fact that Parthenius 36 makes Rhesus the lover of Arganthonē, who went from Cios to the Trojan War, and was killed by Diomedes near a river that bore his name. For since Rhesus is said to have fallen in love with Arganthonē at Cios, and since we can learn from Homer a) that he was killed by Diomedes and b) that there was a river Rhesus near Troy, nothing was easier to invent than that Rhesus, when he had come from Cios to Troy, was killed at the river Rhesus. Parthenius’ story is that Rhesus wandered through many lands and imposed tribute on many peoples, which may not improbably signify the migrations of the Thracians who worshipped the hero Rhesus. And by the marriage of Rhesus and Arganthonē one might suppose that the mingling of the Phrygian-Thracian stock with that of the Mysi is meant.<sup>91</sup>

And if we ask, by what people and at what times the tradition of Rhesus was brought into Asia, of course we can’t say anything for certain about that, because the whole question of when and from where the various Thraco-Phrygian people crossed over to Asia is not yet sufficiently studied. But if we can make a conjecture, Rhesus’ tradition might easily have come to the Troad earlier than the composition of *Iliad* 12, and before the invasion of the Cimmerians, from the Edones or some race closely akin to them;

p. 23

particularly since among that part of this people who lived, or had remained, near the Strymon, as we saw earlier (pp.12, 15), the tradition about Rhesus still flourished. As for Rhesus’ memory

---

<sup>90</sup> *Porphyrii Quaestiones Homericae ad Iliadem Pertinentes*, Leipzig 1880, 50.

<sup>91</sup> Arrian preserved a tradition that Mysus and Bithynus were the sons of Arganthonē (fr. 40, FHG III 594), which no doubt refers to the blood relation between Mysi and Bithyni; although there is no tradition preserved which makes them the sons of Rhesus as well as Arganthonē.

and tradition still flourishing in Bithynia, before the migration of the Bithyni the Mysians held Cios,<sup>92</sup> and they probably migrated to Asia after the Phrygians (Tomaschek I 47). So whether the Phrygo-Thracian peoples, or, since they come into one's mind first, the Bithyni brought Rhesus' cult over with them, is not easily decided. However, I think it more likely that the Bithyni did this, because in Parthenius' narrative, Arganthon, the cult-heroine, was living at Cios before Rhesus came there—a conclusion which is not worth much, I admit, unless we can assume that Arganthon was of Mysian origin. Also, Herodotus (8.75) claims, and with confidence, that the Bithyni were themselves "Strymonians," and originally from the same valley of the Strymon which was Rhesus' native land.

Philostratus (in his *Heroicus* 149<sup>93</sup>) says that the Rhesus, whom Diomedes had killed at Troy, still lived on Mt. Rhodope (in Thrace), and tells of many wonders attributed to him, as that he brought up his horses and hunted wild beasts from them in heavy armor. That he was a hunter is shown by the fact that animals of their own will would approach his altar and offer themselves to be sacrificed; that he warded off pestilence from Mt. Rhodope is why the mountain and its neighborhood is so well populated. Now we know that the author of the *Heroicus* attempts to embroider, and amplify rhetorically, the cults of heroes which flourished in his own age, as scholars are agreed;<sup>94</sup> and so we should examine carefully whether Philostratus' stories about Rhesus are worth our attention.

But in that respect, one must certainly consider this, that in the *Heroicus* Rhesus is treated as a hero among other heroes, and also that at least some of the things Philostratus tells us about his gallery of heroes are believable historical fact. He tells us that Amphiaras, swallowed up by earth as he supposedly was, gave oracles, which in many other

p. 24

places is of course confirmed as true.<sup>95</sup> No less a commonplace was it that Amphilochus, after the fall of Troy, founded oracles at many places in Asia Minor (Mallus, Colophon, etc.), the most famous being Mallus,<sup>96</sup> which is perhaps what, you might be right to suspect, Philostratus means by describing it as he does; and there are many other passages that show that Maron, (a son of Dionysus and) the hero of the sweet wine, was worshipped at Maroneia (in Thrace near Mt. Rhodope).<sup>97</sup>

But since in the story Philostratus tells about Rhesus, words such as "he is said to dwell...they sing of many miracles of his.... for they say"<sup>98</sup> can be assigned to no other region

---

<sup>92</sup> Sölch, *Klio* 19 (1925) 149.

<sup>93</sup> The *Heroicus* is perhaps by Philostratus III Lemnius, as Münscher argues, *Philologus* Suppl. 10 1907, 497ff, 508, 557.

<sup>94</sup> Schmid, *Atticismus* IV, Stuttgart 1896, 497ff, 571; Münscher 502; Grentrup, *De Heroici Philostratei fabularum fontibus*, diss. Monasterii (Münster) 1914; Christ-Schmid II<sup>6</sup> 778. However, Katz's opinion of the *Heroicus* (S. Katz, "Zur Mythenbehandlung in Philostratos, *Heroikos*," *Primitiae Czernovicienses* 1909, 118: "nichts als eine Epideixis," mere epideictic rhetoric) is accepted, very rightly by Freidrich (Woch. Kl. Phil. 1914 794), Münscher (Bu. Jb. 170, n. 135) and Grentrup (8).

<sup>95</sup> See the illustrative material Wolff collects on *Heroicus* 148 (17 in modern texts), in Roscher (=Ro.) I 298, 20ff.

<sup>96</sup> Stoll, in Ro. I 305, 47ff.

<sup>97</sup> Pausanias 1.34.2, Stoll, Ro. I 306 14ff.

<sup>98</sup> *Odyssey* 9. 196-200 (the wine with which Odysseus made the Cyclops drunk was a gift from Maron); Eur. *Cyclops* 141, 412. A coin of Maroneia has the legend MAPQN, and an inscription there was set up by "a priest...of Dionysus



than Mt. Rhodope and its inhabitants, it would appear the story was one preserved in those regions. And that is proven by the fact that the “vinedresser” (who is the principal speaker in the *Heroicus*) begins his story in *oratio obliqua*: (it is said) “that a sign is...” So therefore, the repeated “it is said that he dwells in Rhodope” (at the start of the story of Rhesus, at 17.3), one can hardly doubt, means that the story was common nowhere else than the region of Rhodope. So, if the principal speaker, the “vinedresser”—and Münscher has shown (498f) that he is the voice of Philostratus himself—says “if we believe this,” “if we sacrifice” (cf. T12), we might even conclude that Philostratus himself had visited the place in question (on Philostratus’ travels, see again Münscher 498) and that he had heard from actual inhabitants the stories he tells.

The question arises whether Philostratus habitually uses stories like this from local mythology. And indeed Grentrup (173) has noted one place where Philostratus makes it explicit that he is following such stories. We can prove equally clearly from another place that he collected local legends: where he says, “one can know this from all the herdsmen and everyone else who lives in Ilium” (*Her.* 22.4). And in that story also (the story of Antilochus) we find many verbs of saying: “it is said,” “they contribute more details,” “and in fact there is something else they tell about Antilochus....” These are indications by which we can more or less

p.25  
be certain that Philostratus collects local legends; see also Grentrup, 66ff, for more such details throughout the *Heroicus*. His list ends with the games that were held in honor of Hector, which certainly fits in well with the other witnesses we possess of Hector’s memory and worship in the Troad.<sup>99</sup> Grentrup notes of the passage he cites at 215, 6ff that it must be taken from local legends belonging to the Troad, since it is recorded nowhere else, and it is unlikely that Philostratus thought it up out of his own imagination.<sup>100</sup>

In many other places in the *Heroicus*, indications of local legends that prevailed in this place or that can be found: the vinedresser claims “there is a story current” that Ajax’s ghost had frightened Trojan shepherds, 18. 4-5, and in that passage too we find an “it is said”; Philostratus also takes from the inhabitants of the Troad the story of the death of Palamedes on that shore “on which he is said” to have been stoned to death by the Achaeans; and when Palamedes is said to have taught the vinedresser how to protect one’s vines from the weather, that is surely a local tradition also.

So taking all these passages together we must come to this conclusion: that it cannot be doubted that Philostratus in writing the *Heroicus* followed popular local legends, or to use Grentrup’s words, *fabulae populares*. And these are recognizable by the frequency which the stock phrases “it is said,” “they say,” “they sing,” “there is a story” are used to mark out to the reader the presence of a “popular fable.” But since many of Philostratus’ popular fables are confirmed by outside testimony, and it is obvious that the heroes of Philostratus’ time really were worshipped with great diligence, and really were believed to be capable of helping and

---

and Maron. (cf. Eckhel, *Doctrina nummorum veterum*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Vienna 1839, II. 34, Reinach, *Bulletin de correspondance Hellénique*, 5, 1881, 94,17); thus Schirmer (Ro. II 2383, 40ff.) and Rothstein (on Propertius 2.34, 14, Berlin 1920) rightly infer that the cult of Maron belonged to Maroneia.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Lehnerdt, Ro. I 1927; Crusius, Sitz. Ber. München 1905, 790f.

<sup>100</sup> Roscher (Ro. I 268, 50) had thought so, but Rohde had already expressed his agreement with Grentrup, *Psyche* II. 373 n.

hurting their worshippers,<sup>101</sup> it seems there is nothing left for us but to believe that what Philostratus says about Rhesus to have been legends still current in and around Mt. Rhodope in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century ad. Now, if the traditions about Rhesus were still current at this late date

p. 26  
in the area around Rhodope, where the Thracians had undoubtedly lived from the most ancient times, that proves for certain that Rhesus was a native Thracian hero.

And I cannot fail, as I come to the end of this chapter, to add that the name itself, “Rhesus,” is in favor of my thesis of a Thracian origin for him. Tomaschek (II 1,53) had already guessed that “Rhesus” would be from some Thracian word from the root *reg-* and mean “king,” and while Leaf rejects this idea without giving a reason (he says flatly “it seems a curious recrudescence of prescientific etymology,” p. 3), Perdrizet (17f. and note 7), Müller (Mnemosyne 46, 1918, 138; Philologus 78, 1923, 273), and Hirt (*Indogermanische Grammatik* I, Heidelberg 1927, 30) all accept Tomaschek’s idea. Kretschmer (Glotta 14, 1925, 103) thinks it is rather to be referred to “reku, rasku, rasc, rasch” (“swift”). At any rate there is no doubt that the name is of Thracian origin, as Sittig (*PW* I A 625) also agrees.

So now let me summarize the argument of my first chapter. The memory and tradition of Rhesus flourished in many places (even outside Thrace) where the peoples of Thrace lived, and all our evidence from antiquity unanimously says he was a Thracian, so it looks as if Rhesus was indeed a Thracian, blood and bone. One cannot argue otherwise without ignoring all the Thracian locales in which Rhesus and the stories about him crop up. His true fatherland, from which his memory spread into many another region, was the valley of the Strymon, particularly the area around (what was later) the city of Amphipolis. And this fact and the other matters I have set forth here I believe will be yet more clearly demonstrated, when we have examined *Rhesus*, the tragedy.

## CHAPTER TWO

In three different verses of the tragedy (279; 304; 652) Rhesus is called the son of Strymon. And that fits with the tradition we saw in Homer, Marsyas the Younger, Conon, and Strabo, all these authors giving us to understand that the tradition about Rhesus originates on the banks of the river Strymon. So therefore, when the *Rhesus* poet calls him the son of Strymon, he is not inventing the relationship.<sup>102</sup> He was merely following the tradition that had already been handed down in the valley of the Strymon.

p. 27  
And now, what we learn from the final scene of the tragedy, whose authority as a source Porter (xvi) has rightly emphasized, must be set out carefully and in detail. For, while the rest of the tragedy has little to say that is not already in the *Doloneia* (*Iliad* 10),<sup>103</sup> the final scene differs entirely from what is in Homer. The Muse, Rhesus’s mother (on whom see pp. 35ff. below) appears with his body in her arms (890ff), mourning him, and prophesies the fate

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Rode, *Psyche* II. 350, 3; Crusius, 791f.

<sup>102</sup> Leaf (7) argued that the relation between Rhesus and Strymon was *invented* by the oracle cited in Polyaeus.

<sup>103</sup> Gottfried Hermann, *Opuscula* III. 262-310 (“De *Rheso* Tragoedia Dissertatio”), 284-5. (Hermann attributes the *Rhesus* to an Alexandrian imitator of epic and tragic style.)

that awaits him. But she forbids Hector, who wishes to bury Rhesus with full honors (959ff), to do so, saying (962-6)

He shall not go into the dark soil of earth;  
this much I shall ask of the bride of the realms below,  
the daughter of Demeter, the goddess of fertility,  
to release his spirit; for she is my debtor,  
and must show she holds in honor Orpheus' kin.

Rhesus is called Orpheus' kin because he is a first cousin of Orpheus (944), since both are sons of a Muse.<sup>104</sup> The Muse's contention that Proserpina is bound to honor the kindred of Orpheus appears to refer to *Rhesus* 943-44, where Orpheus is said to have taught the Athenians the most sacred Mysteries, and we can easily believe that he was in Proserpine's favor because he did this. Now, whether these Mysteries Orpheus taught were *the* Mysteries, the Eleusinia, as Porter (xix) says, following Jane Ellen Harrison,<sup>105</sup> must remain in doubt, since Kern (*Athenische Mitteilungen* 16, 1891, 14; *Orpheus*, Berlin 1920, 30) and Farnell (*The Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford 1907, III. 152), high authorities in the history of Greek religion, deny that Orpheus had any important role in Eleusinian worship. E. Maass (*Orpheus*, Munich 1895, 66-69) held that Proserpina played a role in the Orphic Mysteries as well. However all that may be, we can hardly deny that the author of the tragedy believed there to be some relationship between Orpheus and the mysteries of Proserpina, whether in real life there was any such relationship or not. But it seems that Perdrizet's idea (*cit.* 16) that Rhesus had moved the heart of Proserpina *by reciting the Orphic songs that were taught to initiates*, so strongly

p. 28

that she allowed him to escape from death, is not right, because what the Muse says in the tragedy does not prove that.

Now the crucial verses for our investigation of Rhesus' status as a Thracian cult-hero are those that follow; the Muse goes on,

κρυπτός δ' ἐν ἄντροις τῆς ὑπαργύρου χθονὸς  
ἄνθρωποδαίμων κείσεται βλέπων φάος,  
Βάκχου προφήτης ὥστε Παγγαίου πέτρων  
ᾧκησε, σεμνὸς τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν θεός.

and hidden in caves below the silver-veined earth  
an *anthropodaimôn* shall lie there, seeing the light,  
just as (ὥστε) a prophet of Bacchus has taken up residence on the rock  
of Pangaeus, a sacred (*semnos*) god to those who know. (1070-1073)  
(or--reading ὅτε-- 'and who as a prophet of Bacchus,' see below.)

In these verses, first, it seems uncertain whether the "sacred god" is Rhesus or a "prophet of Bacchus," and then, who that "prophet of Bacchus" should be. Now, Porter (xix)

<sup>104</sup> Orpheus is frequently thought to be the son of Calliope; for references see Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, Brunswick 1884, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., II 1078.

<sup>105</sup> She argued that many practices were taken over from the Orphic cult of Dionysus by the hierophants at Eleusis, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge 1908, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 539-71 (on specifically Thracian influence, 553-6).

decided rightly, I think, that the words “sacred god” are predicated of the “prophet of Bacchus.” The space between *anthropodaimôn* and *semnos...theos* is too long for the hearer to fill in without hesitation *anthropodaimôn* when he hears *semnos*.

Who is this “prophet of Bacchus”? Learned commentators greatly differ here. But in examining this question we must first take account of the fact that there was, even earlier, a cult of Bacchus on Mt. Pangaeus. For Herodotus (7. 111) says, as part of his description of Xerxes’ march through Thrace, that the Satrae, (one of the native peoples of Pangaeus,) maintained an oracle of Bacchus in the mountain heights, and that the Bessi, another such, were the interpreters of the oracles, which were spoken by a priestess “just as at Delphi”; and in the next chapter, 7.112, he says that the Satrae, the Pieres, and the Odomantes were the principal (*malista*) inhabitants of Mt. Pangaeus. And some scholars believe that Lycurgus, a prophet of Bacchus, is meant by this passage.<sup>106</sup> Now, this is the story (familiar in mythology) that Lycurgus, king of the Edones, persecuted Dionysus and his nurses on Mt. Nysa, and was blinded, as had already been told in Homer; and Sophocles<sup>107</sup> says that he was imprisoned in rock by the angry Bacchus. Now this Lycurgus was later confused with Bacchus himself, as Strabo mentions (10. 3. 16), and therefore Thraemer (Ro. I 1052) conjectures that Lycurgus figured in the religion and cult-worship that the

p. 29  
Edones gave Dionysus. But the idea that Lycurgus, an enemy and persecutor of Dionysus, should become his “prophet” is unlikely, and therefore it is improbable that our passage of the *Rhesus* should be making a tacit reference to him.

However, Ernst Maass (*Orpheus*, Munich 1895, 68ff, 134ff) argues that the “prophet of Bacchus” is none other than Orpheus himself, whom the Muse has just named (966), on the following grounds. Aeschylus, in his lost *Bassarai*,<sup>108</sup> (a fragment of which mentions Mt. Pangaeus,) told the story that Orpheus was torn in pieces by the Maenads of Thrace, but his scattered bones were collected by the Muses, and buried “in the place called Libethra.” Now Libethra was near Olympus and close to Dium (Strabo 7. 330, 18), where in later times a tomb of Orpheus was to be seen, as Pausanias tells us (9.30.7). But since there was a tradition that the Pieres, who lived near Olympus, were driven out by the Macedonians and migrated to the region around Mt. Pangaeus (Hdt. 7.112; Thuc. 2.99, Strabo 9.410); and since Himerius (*Or.* 13.4) speaks of Libethrians who worshipped Orpheus on Mt. Pangaeus, where they had collected his scattered bones; it seems improbable that Aeschylus (in the *Bassarids*) said that the Muses who were rescuing Orpheus’ bones took them *from* Pangaeus, where they had collected them, to Olympus to be buried. No; in Aeschylus the bones of Orpheus were buried where his play took place, on Mt. Pangaeus.

<sup>106</sup> Vater (*Euripides, Rhesus*, Berlin 1837) translates “Rhesus shall be a *numen* there, even as Lycurgus, the priest of Bacchus, dwells in Pangaeum as a sacred god.” So also Thraemer, Ro. I. 1051, Marbach *PW* 13 2438, 31ff.

<sup>107</sup> *Iliad* 7.137ff, *Antigone* 955ff; The myth of Lycurgus was also treated by Eumelus (fr. 10 Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* I, Leipzig 1877, 192), and Aeschylus in his *Bassarids*, Nauck fr. 23-25; on which see p. 29 below. On the Sophocles passage see E. Bruhn, Schneidewin-Nauck, *Sophokles* IV: *Antigone* (11<sup>th</sup> edition, Berlin 1913) ad loc.,

<sup>108</sup> Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* p. 9; cf. Eratosthenes, *Catasterismorum Reliquiae*, ed. C. Robert, Berlin 1878, 140.

This was Maass' argument, and Perdrizet (30) attempted to refute it by supposing that Himerius was in error and thought the Libethrians lived on Pangaeus. And certainly, the writers on geography in late antiquity were very prone to error. But as the Pieres, who as we said had lived earlier near Libethrum and Olympus, migrated later on to inhabit Pangaeus, what Himerius said has to be true. Besides, Maass (135,18) brings into play other references that prove that Orpheus was brought to the Pangaeus area. For example, Virgil (*Georgics* 4.507ff) says that when Orpheus lost his wife Eurydice for the second time,

for seven months, by the wind-blown rock at the river  
Strymon's deserted flood, he wept and worked out these words  
in its chilly caves...

Iamblichus (*Vit. Pythag.* 146) says that Pythagoras was initiated by Aglaophamus into the mysterious rites at Libethrum, and, on Aglaophamus' testimony, claimed that Orpheus the son of Calliope, was educated on Mt. Pangaeus, and thus it was there that he "spoke the sacred number that is the eternal and most providential cause of the whole heaven and earth and all natures in between them..." So, on the witness of these passages (and more: Maass 136, 18), we know that the tradition associated Orpheus with Pangaeus. And thus

p.30

Maass does not hesitate to claim that the author of *Rhesus*' real meaning (at lines 1070-1073) is as follows: Rhesus is turned, in the caverns of the silver-bearing earth, from a (dead) human being into a daimon that sees light (i.e. is alive: cf. the edition of Vater 1837, 279, comparing Aesch. *Persae* 299, *Eum.* 746.), *in the same way that*, ὥστε, Orpheus, prophet of Bacchus, "took up his residence " (for the aorist ὤκησε is ingressive) in the rocks of Mt. Pangaeus, and is "a sacred god to those who know" (i.e. are wise: Porter xxi).

However, Wilamowitz ("Lelesefrüchte," *Hermes* 61 1926, 277-303, at 285 and n. 1) called it into question whether Orpheus could indeed be called "a sacred god." But perhaps the poet was thinking of him as a participant in some lesser kind of divine nature, given that the claim made in the *Rhesus* is that (only) *to the initiated* (τοῖς ἐιδομένοις) could he be deemed a "sacred god." If we go with this version, he could also have functioned as a "prophet of Bacchus"—a role which Wilamowitz rightly holds is incompatible with the divine nature in the strict sense. But as Otto Kern showed (*Orpheus*, Berlin 1920, 26, 28) there is nothing remarkable about calling Orpheus "prophet of Bacchus." So Maass' view may be doubtful, but it does not seem to me that it has been so far undermined that we should repudiate it.

Now Perdrizet (27, lines 10ff.), as before him also Matthiae and Musgrave (cf. the citations of them in Vater 1837, 279) thought Rhesus himself was the "prophet of Bacchus," because there is no tradition we know of that makes Lycurgus or Orpheus "prophets." Besides, the grammar of verses 972-3 is not perfectly consonant with 970-1, and the comparison introduced by ὥστε, he claims, is wobbly and lame. And therefore, since ὥστε is probably wrong, he argues for ὅστε, which is in the codex Palatinus (ὅστε, P<sup>2</sup>) or ὅς γε, as superior readings. But Perdrizet's complaint about the grammar is a feeble argument, because in the tragic poets, there are several examples of ὥστε put *after* the thing with which this or that is compared.<sup>109</sup> Besides, ὅστε, though but a trivial change in reading from ὥστε, does not give us

<sup>109</sup> Aesch. *Supp.* 750ff, *Ag.* 671, *Soph. Trach.* 536ff; see also *Soph. fr.* 756, Nauck = Pearson *Fragments of Sophocles* vol. 3, fr.840 p. 54.

any further reason to refer the new meaning (“he who”, “and who”) any more to “Bacchus” than to “prophet.” Leaf (*cit.* 5, 11) takes ὅτε of the “prophet;” yet for the same reason he says that this reading is false, because it shouldn’t happen that part of the “prophecy” should be in the

p. 31

(past) aorist indicative.<sup>110</sup> And although I think that that last point is correct, I also think Perdrizet (*cit.* 27) connected ὅτε with Βάκχου, though that can’t be seen clearly in his translation: “Rhesus will be the prophet of the god of the mysteries, he who has the rocky cliffs of Pangaeus for his throne.” So, Perdrizet argues, there are two facts which the poet claims to know:

- I. that Rhesus is worshipped at Amphipolis,
- II. that above Amphipolis (on the “rocky cliffs”) there was a great oracle of Bacchus which was managed by the Bessae.

So then Rhesus was given a role as the prophet of Bacchus, Perdrizet thinks, in order to guide the minds and spirits of the Bessae, themselves προφηταί, who interpreted the oracles. But here we arrive at another difficulty. If so, why should the “prophet” be said to live on, not in the same place where the oracle was, on the “rocky cliffs” above, but at the bottom of the cliffs in a cave near Amphipolis? Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 61 1926, 185-line 1ff) interprets the line in question in almost the same way as Perdrizet, though he avoids this difficulty. He says that neither Lycurgus nor Orpheus could be called “prophet of Bacchus” or “a god”: rather, these functions should be assigned to Rhesus himself, and so he also reads ὅτε. Rhesus will live in the cave, as a prophet of Bacchus, *who* (Bacchus) will be a sacred god to those who are wise.” Easy as the emendation ὅτε looks, however, and gracefully as the grammar is now made to cohere, there are two obstacles in the way of our accepting Wilamowitz’s reading. In the first place, a reader or hearer of the words Βάκχου προφήτης ὅτε...will inevitably take the relative pronoun to refer to προφήτης, not Βάκχου. And in the second place, Wilamowitz tries to explain Bacchus’ being called “a sacred god to those who know” as meaning that Bacchus is a god of the Thracians, and less “known” to the Greeks. But Attic tragedy itself originated in the cult of Bacchus, and who would ever believe that in the 4<sup>th</sup> century bc he was a god little known to the Greeks? And this is why the words σεμνὸς τοῖσιν εἶδοσιν θεός, “a god, but only to those who know,” can only be referring to a lesser sort of divine being. Again, Ridgeway (*CQ* 20 1926, 17f) is wrong to make Bacchus and Dionysus two different gods and say that it is Dionysus who is called the “prophet of Bacchus”—an argument which Nock (“The End of the Rhesus,” *CR* 40 1926, 184-6, at 185) rightly rejects.<sup>111</sup>

p. 32

But Nock himself refuses the emendation and reads ὥστε, arguing that it is Zalmoxis, a hero who is supposed to have taught the Getae a belief in immortality (and who was said to live on among them in an underground cavern, cf. Herodotus 4. 194-6), who is here called “prophet of Bacchus.” For he relies on the testimony of Herodotus, Strabo (7. 297, cf. 16. 762) and

<sup>110</sup> And there is the same problem, if we try to make Rhesus into the prophet of Bacchus (i.e. the Muse can’t prophesy that he’s “taken up residence”), or if we try to translate ὥστε as “therefore.”

<sup>111</sup> Note that Rempe cites several different periodical articles that appeared in 1926, just in time to be included in his argument. --DA

Hellanicus (fr. 73 Jacoby) to establish that Zalmoxis may well have been called “the prophet of Bacchus.” However, since the worship of Zalmoxis appears to have been centered in regions further to the north of Thrace, we would have to conclude that the author of the *Rhesus* (who locates his hero at Pangaeus) was ignorant of topography, though Nock himself is reluctant to admit this. At any rate, Nock believes that it was possible, that among a people (like the Thracians) who had cults of Zalmoxis and Orpheus, and worshipped Bacchus in many different places, there may have been flourishing traditions about other heroes whose traces have vanished. But some of Nock’s arguments are far from clear. He takes the *anthrôpodaimôn* to be identical with the “prophet of Bacchus” even though he would write not ὄκτη but ὠκτη, and therefore at the end of his note he argues that Rhesus was being *compared* with this prophet. So, his contention is, as I interpret it, that Zalmoxis was the “prototype” of those divine prophets that Strabo says (7. 3.5) were present as advisers to the king of the Getae. So also, that “prophet of Bacchus” mentioned in our passage from the *Rhesus* was the “prototype” of those prophets of Bacchus who, in the oracular shrine of Bacchus on the heights of Mt. Pangaeus, are said by Herodotus (7.111) to have played the role of prophet. And this “prototypical” prophet was called by the name of “prophet of Bacchus” and shared in the cult of Bacchus on Pangaeus. Nock’s conclusion is not totally convincing, even if it appears to me one not to be simply rejected out of hand.

To sum up this review of the various options for interpreting these verses, none of the opinions these scholars offer us appears to be so thoroughly demonstrated or backed up with evidence as to leave no room for doubt; I concede that. But though one can hardly settle finally for one or the other, I like Maass’ account of them much the best.

We saw above, at any rate, that already in the time of Marsyas the Younger (c. 150 bc) there was a tomb of Rhesus, at Amphipolis, and I have tried to prove that it was built by Thracians and not Greeks. And that fits well with the Muse’s prophecy in the *Rhesus* of her son’s dwelling place; for in considering her prophecy, that Rhesus would dwell in a cave, and Marsyas’ telling us a memorial shrine of Rhesus had been built

p. 33

opposite to the hill in which there was a shrine of the Muse, one has to keep the nature of the place in mind. For Amphipolis was built on a hill rising up from the valley of the Strymon and surrounded by the river’s flow on three sides. But the “chilly caves” on the left bank of the Strymon Virgil also mentions in the same place (*Georg.* 4.507ff) that we cited earlier. Thus, the cave of Rhesus was at the bottom of this hill, near the river itself, and was later graced with a sepulcher, opposite which, and further up the hill on which Amphipolis stood, the shrine of the Muse Clio was built.

It cannot be doubted that at Amphipolis, therefore, by the banks of his father Strymon, there were both a cave and a sepulcher of Strymon’s son, the hero Rhesus, and that the Thracians of Amphipolis worshipped Rhesus there; even if we cannot know how he was worshipped, because on that topic we have no evidence at all.

Now Leaf (3ff) stubbornly denied that there *was* any cult of Rhesus, on the authority of Cicero (*De Natura Deorum*, 3.45: T13). Cicero denies that Orpheus and Rhesus, children of Muses, can possibly be gods “because they are nowhere worshipped.” Rohde (cf. *Psyche* I. 162 w/notes) tried to reply that perhaps there was no such cult *in Cicero’s day*. But Leaf will not let this excuse stand, because if Cicero says there was none, then it follows that to none of the

Alexandrian writers on religion that Cicero would presumably have used for authorities, strenuous as they were in finding material from every possible source to support their every opinion, was anything known about a cult of Rhesus. Or so Leaf claimed. It's easy for us to show, however, that this opinion of his is "writ in water." What was Leaf's reason for being so convinced that Cicero, when he offered this opinion offhand in the course of an argument, had to have followed multiple Alexandrian commentators of great learning? After all Orpheus, whom Cicero says had no cult, any more than Rhesus did, certainly was worshipped, if not with divine, then with heroic honors, as is well known.<sup>112</sup> As for Rohde's thinking Rhesus was a god, I doubt it; but that will be explained below, at p. 50. But this I know for certain: the author of the tragedy has to have taken his cue from the Thracians themselves, when he brings the Muse on stage to describe Rhesus' underground cave.

Now, as far as "the Muse" being (without any further identification) called Rhesus' mother in the play (349ff., 387, 393, 651f., 890ff., 919ff.),  
P.34

the sources are old, many, and easily at hand. And if we ask whether the Thracians or the Greeks so named the mother of the hero we are discussing, it is important to know whether the Greeks or the Thracians first conceived and spread the notion about of the band of Muses itself.<sup>113</sup> We know that they were worshipped from earliest times in the region around Mt. Olympus and especially at Libethrum and Pimplea, and later were moved to Helicon (in Boeotia), as children of Zeus and Mnemosyne;<sup>114</sup> and in that form they travelled and were recognized throughout the ancient world. And though Hesiod first (*Theog.* 1, *Op.* 658) put them on Helicon, it was not his purpose to dissolve their relationship with Olympus. Rather, in many a verse, he calls them *Olympiades* (*Th.* 25,36, 51, 75, 114; *Op.* 2), or similar names, and again, it is he who (first) witnesses that they were born in Pieria (*Th.* 53), and first gives them the number of nine (*Th.* 76, cf. *Odyssey* 24.60). In Homer's epics they had been a chorus of uncertain number, not seldom joined with Apollo, goddesses excellent at singing, and ardently loving their art (*Il.* 1.604, 2. 598; Hes. *Th.* 37, *Op.* 2, *Odyssey* 24.60). Or we find just one Muse, liberally aiding poets, or helping them sing (*Il.* 1.1, 2. 484, 492, 761; 11.218;14. 508; 16. 112; *Od.* 1.1, 8.73, 480, 24.62; *Th.* 114, *Op.* 662). It is Strabo (10 .471) and Pausanias (9.29. 3) who are our authorities that their cult was moved *by the Thracians* to Helicon. But whether the Thracians ever lived in mainland Greece, as Hellanicus (fr. 42 Jacoby), Thucydides (2.29) and Ephorus (fr. 119 Jacoby=Strabo p. 401) affirm, has been questioned in modern times by many scholars. Wilamowitz (*Aus Kydathen*, Berlin 1880, 95ff., 100,103, 105) thought that the Thracians had indeed once been Boeotians, and of mainland Greek origin. Hiller v. Gaertringen refuted this opinion (*cit.*52, 55, 56). He does not claim certainty on this topic himself, yet he considers the Orphics to have played a great role in shaping this tradition, and hopes that from better editions of the *Orphica* and their teachings and myths, research could proceed further, so that, "by doing away with much material that both ancient and modern scholars have wrongly attributed to the Thracians,

p. 35

<sup>112</sup> Gruppe, Ro. III 1082f, 1084f; Baege *cit.* 182, Kern *Orpheus* 17; 24-line 2ff.

<sup>113</sup> On the Muses: Preller-Robert, *Gr. Myth.* I 484ff, Bie in Ro. II 3228ff.

<sup>114</sup> *Iliad* 2.491, 598; 8. 468; Hes. *Theogony* 25, 53, 76, 915; *Op.* 2.



that which remains can be used with greater confidence, to restore a more accurate picture of the Thracians who lived in early Greece.”<sup>115</sup> Toepffer, however (*cit.* 805) affirms without hesitation that some of the Thracian peoples had migrated down to mainland Greece. E. Meyer (*cit.* 805) leaves the question unsolved whether the stories about Thracian Daulians and Eleusinians are true or false, and Fimmen (*Neue Jahrbücher* 1912, 535-6) agrees with him, but concedes that at least some Thracian expeditions and migrations into mainland Greece probably occurred. Beloch, however (*cit.* I, 1, 70; II 2, 56ff) thinks that the idea that Thracians established themselves (on the mainland) at Helicon and in Phocis is mere invention by later writers, who were trying to account for the worship of the Muses both on Helicon and on Olympus, and for coincidences in some proper names in Pieria and Boeotia, which may have occurred by chance. These later writers thought up this explanation so that they could argue that the Muses were introduced into mainland Greece by Thracians. Gavril Kazárow, “Die Ethnographische Stelle der Páonen” *Klio* 18, 1923, 20-26, rejects all their opinions and argues for Toepffer’s view of the Thracian peoples’ actually dwelling in the mainland.

In view of all this discord and contradiction, I do not myself venture to offer any final resolution on the question of the Thracians of mainland Greece or the origin of the Muses. But, once more, I can give my *opinion* of their origin, for what it’s worth. Even though it looks probable that in forming a mental picture of the Muses the Greeks allowed the tradition of the Thracians a certain value, because of the kind of interaction between the Thracian peoples and the cult of the Muses that was handed down in Greek literary tradition, I feel that in evolving their picture of the Muses they relied mainly on their their own cultural endowments. Because both the very word “Muse”<sup>116</sup> and the names for each of the Nine are Greek; and the roles assigned them individually as fosterers and favorers of arts and letters, and supremely brilliant singers and performers, are so in line with the inventive genius of the Greeks that it seems absurd to think they borrowed these goddesses from some other people.

But since we are not able to determine whether the Muses were thought up first by Greeks or by Thracians, let’s consider in which place

p. 36

Thamyras (on whom see Höfer, *Ro.* V 464fff, Preller-Robert II 43ff) was first said to have held his contest with the Muses. In the tragedy, *Rhesus* 915ff. (after cursing Diomedes, Odysseus and Helen for the death of her son) the Muse places the contest with Thamyras on Mt. Pangaeus, as one can easily see, because this gives her a good occasion to explain how she came to conceive her son Rhesus: it was in crossing the Strymon (and being seduced by its river-god), after she and the other Muses had defeated Thamyras (on Pangaeus) and blinded him. So that if we can show that, before the *Rhesus* was written, there was some other place where the story of Thamyras’ contest with the Muses was supposed to have happened, it becomes implausible that the author was using older traditions. We will judge, instead, that it is far more probable that the *Rhesus* poet made this up himself or followed some other Greek poet of earlier date than himself. And therefore, our first point should be that in the Catalogue of Ships (*Iliad* 2.

<sup>115</sup> *Attische Genealogie*, Berlin 1889, 38 line 1.

<sup>116</sup> Preller-Robert I 485, Curtius (*Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., Leipzig 1873, 312), Bie, *Ro.* II 3228, Leo Meyer (*Lehrbuch der griechischen Etymologie*, Leipzig 1902, IV 361), all agree that Μοῦσα is from Μοῦσα ) Μοῦσα, the root being mon- men- (cf. mind, monitor, etc.).

594ff, cited at Pausanias 4. 33.7, describing Dorium, in Messene) Thamyras is said, on returning from Oechalia, and its king Eurytus, to have been blinded and struck dumb *at Dorium*<sup>117</sup> by the Muses because of his hybris, for he had boasted that he would win first place, even in a contest with them. Stephanus Byzantinus' version is that the contest was at Dotium<sup>118</sup> (in Thessaly), and he explains (s.v. Δότιον) that he had read in "Orus' *Ethnica*" that that was Hesiod's reading. But Sophocles, to judge from a fragment of his *Thamyras* (fr. N216, Radt 237), Θρήϊσσα(ν) σκοπιὰ(ν) Ζηνός Ἀθώου, "a Thracian peak of Zeus, the lord of Athos," is rightly said by them to have moved the contest with the Muses up to Thrace. And after Sophocles, the tradition was unanimous that Thamyras was himself Thracian, and lived, and in fact was born, in the peninsula of Acte (and near Mt. Athos). Thus, Asclepiades (of Tragila, 4<sup>th</sup> century bc author of a *Tragoidoumena*, "On the Subjects of Tragedy,") said the Muses *came to Thrace* to hold their contest with Thamyras.<sup>119</sup> And Conon (*Narration* 7) said that a nymph from the Peloponnesus, having become pregnant by a youth named Philammon, fled to Acte, and there gave birth to Thamyras, who grew up and became so excellent a lyre-player that the Scythae made him their king, foreigner though he was. Then Conon goes on to narrate the contest with the Muses. Thamyras is said, even,

p. 37

to have been king of the peninsula of Acte also by Strabo, cited in nearly the same words by Eustathius (7. 331.35, cf. Eustathius 299, 6ff). Pausanias (4.33.3)<sup>120</sup> gives a similar account. Thamyras was the son of Philammon and Argiope, the nymph, who when she had fled from Mt. Parnassus to the Odrysae, gave birth to him there, which is why he was called an "Odrysian" or a "Thracian."<sup>121</sup> In such a diverse tradition it is no wonder that some writers allow for two different bards named Thamyras.<sup>122</sup>

For this reason, it is very difficult to judge which tradition about Thamyras and his origins is "right." For although he is called a Thracian in almost all our sources, they all give him parents with Greek names. And though Homer and Hesiod locate his doings in Greece, the rest of the tradition places him in Thrace, where some claim he was born, others that he migrated there. And the opinions of scholars on this story also strongly disagree. Wilamowitz holds that both Orpheus and Thamyras are Greek heroes by birth and only came to be thought of as Thracians in later times,<sup>123</sup> but Toepffer (*Attische Genealogie*, 1889, 34f) and Gruppe (Ro. III 1978,28) disagree. I am content to have established a point that is more relevant to our inquiry,

<sup>117</sup> On Dorium and Oechalia in Messenia, cf. Strabo 8.350 and Ameis-Hentz-Cauer on *Il.* 2.596.

<sup>118</sup> B. Niese (*Hom. Schiffskat. als hist. Quelle betrachtet*, Kiel 1873, 22) argued that the composer of the Catalogue had used this supposed citation from Hesiod for the place but miscopied it as Dorium, not Dotium; and Christ (*Gr. Lit.* I, 6<sup>th</sup> edn., 24 line 5) thought that the most ancient sources had had Thamyras and his contest taking place at Dorium. But in my view, Meineke, in his edition of Stephanus (Berlin 1849), rightly concluded that Homer had indeed said the contest was at Dorium, and Hesiod moved it to Dotium, cf. Höfer, Ro. 5.470.

<sup>119</sup> Schol. on *Rhesus* 916: cf. RM 63, 1908, 420.

<sup>120</sup> In this passage Pausanias says that the river Balyra in Messenia got its name from Thamyras' having thrown away his lyre (βαλ-, λυπα-) when he was blinded—a detail which, as Heberdey saw, was taken from a comment on *Iliad* 2. 395 (Höfer, Ro. V 469, 25).

<sup>121</sup> This story is rightly ascribed by Hiller v. Gaertringen (*PW* II 719) to the invention of writers of later times, seeking to explain why Thamyras should be called a Thracian.

<sup>122</sup> As does the scholion on *Rhesus* 916.

<sup>123</sup> *Hom. Unters.* 212, *Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad.* Berlin, 1925, 56.

that is, who first located the contest of Thamyras and the Muses in Thrace. Robert (*Gr. Myth.* II 415) thought that Sophocles began this tradition, for he considers it clear from *Rhesus* 921ff. that the poet is following the lead of Sophocles' *Thamyras*. But though I willingly concede that Sophocles' play was known to the *Rhesus* poet, that does not prove Robert's contention in any way. For the Sophocles fragment leads us to Athos and no further. And indeed Conon, *Narrations* 7, points the same way: "(the nymph) in shame fled from the Peloponnesus and when she arrived gave birth to Thamyris." Robert (II 415 line 5) thinks that Actê is a place in Attica, and that it cannot

p. 38

here signify the peninsula in Thrace, because Thamyras in the next lines is called an *epêlutês*, a foreigner in Thrace, but I do not agree. First, Thamyras could be called this even though born in Actê, because the nymph had come there just before giving birth, and the father was a foreigner. Also, Pausanias says (4.33.3) that Argiope had migrated to the Odrysians and there gave birth to Thamyras (so perhaps, as an "Odrysian," he was Skythian); and Strabo (7.331, 35), followed by Eustathius (299.6ff), says that Thamyras was a Thracian. and king in Acte; but the "Skythians" in these two places are called Thracians, as Kanne (*Cononis Narrationes*, Göttingen 1798, 83) and Hoefer (cf. Conon 65f. and Ro. V 471) say, because the names "Scythian" and "Thracian" are interchangeable in poetry; so also Robert (II 415). Moreover, Pausanias' version is distorted and thus of less value, since Argiope is moved by him to Mt. Parnassus. and emigrates because Philammon refuses to marry her; and also, Conon does not name Argiope at all, and in Strabo's version Thamyras is returned to Actê (and Mt. Athos). So therefore, Robert did not succeed in his effort to show that Sophocles had been the first to locate the contest of Thamyras with the Muses on Mt. Pangaeus, as I think. And since no other reference locates the contest in Pangaeus, I feel it is at least probable that the poet of the *Rhesus* was the first to invent this detail. But it is very sad that the passage, or even entire tragedy, by Aeschylus, in which the scholiast on *Rhesus* 916 says he dealt with Thamyras, has perished. However, I think my opinion is made probable by the very words the Muse is given in the *Rhesus*. For the Muse explains at considerable length (915ff) how it happened that she came to find herself in the river-god Strymon's bed, and I feel that anyone who reads her speech can see that the poet is making up some new details for the story, which he has thought up on his own, that he might be provided with a reason she was crossing the Strymon at that point. So if that is acceptable, it results that the Muse was first called the mother of Rhesus by the Greeks, and in my belief, by the *Rhesus* poet himself.

It appears to me to favor this view, that, because the *Rhesus* poet nowhere indicates the *name* of the Muse, who bore Rhesus, there was already quite a row between the ancient commentators about which of them she was. For some said, Clio (schol. *Rh.* 346=T13)

p. 39

was Rhesus' mother, among whom the scholiast (as we shall see later) names Marsyas the younger; some Euterpe, as do Heraclides (*ib.*) and Apollodorus (*ib.*, *Bibliotheca* I. 3, 4; cf. schol. ABΓ and Eustathius on *Il.* 435); others Terpsichore, as did Aristophanes of Byzantium, as we learn from the Hypothesis to the play, and others, mentioned in the A scholion to *Il.* 10. 435 alike. Finally, Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* offered Calliope as an alternative mother for Rhesus. Such diversity of opinion would hardly have arisen if there was any good authority for the name

of Rhesus' mother. And the author of the *Rhesus* himself, since there was no earlier authority, appears not to have ventured to give her a name.

Finally, it arouses surprise in the reader, or hearer, of the tragedy that the Muse is so often said to be Rhesus' mother. The chorus (349ff) explains that Strymon, a river "with beautiful bridges," had begotten Rhesus on a Muse; and again makes this point later on when Rhesus makes his entrance (385ff): "A god, O Troy, a god, Ares himself, you colt of Strymon and son of the tuneful Muse, breathes valor into you," and Hector adds (393f) "O child of the songful mother, one of the Muses, and of the Thracian river, the Strymon..." Even as Athena (651ff) is deceiving Paris into thinking she herself has sent Rhesus as an ally to Troy, she reiterates "I have come to bring you a powerful friend, the son of one of the Muses, his mother, and the child, as he is called, of the Thracian river, Strymon..." Indeed, both here and at 393, the Muse is named first and the Strymon second, so that the audience could have it that much more clearly in their ears and minds that a Muse is Rhesus' mother. I believe that the poet said this over and over to admonish the audience again and again that "a Muse is Rhesus' mother;" a thing he would hardly have done, if already in older plays and poems earlier than his own such a story had been handed down as the tradition.

It remains to ask how it came into the mind of the author of the *Rhesus* to make  
p. 40

a Muse Rhesus' mother. But in this matter, we must remember how many other heroes and poets had been said to be sons of the Muses (the scholia to *Il.* 10. 435 and *Rh.* 346 = T14 give lists of the Muses' children), so it is hardly all that wonderful that the same fiction was applied to Rhesus.

But probably the reason this poet has thought of it can be known more clearly, if we interpret the fragment of Marsyas the Younger (fr. 6=schol. *Rhesus* 346) which we have already noticed earlier (p 12-13), in greater detail. At first glance it appears that Marsyas himself thought Clío was Rhesus' mother, but in fact the scholiast was not right about that. Because from Marsyas' words εἰς δὲ οἱ καὶ περὶ τούτου εἶπον, "there are those also who say on this topic..." we can know that Marsyas is actually giving the belief of others, not his own, and that he used the particle καί, "also," in order to indicate that he has joined what is to follow to the preceding words. In those words, we assume, Marsyas had stated his own beliefs, and then added this statement in the same manner in which, when we offer a further opinion of other people's that is different from our own, we say, "*Es gibt aber auch Leute, die betreffen dieses Mannes behaupten,*" "there are however *also* people, who claim, about this person..." Do not be surprised, either, that καί, "also", has been construed by me as joined with οἱ, not περὶ τούτου, because the locution εἰς δὲ οἱ so closely coalesces and coheres that it cannot allow the καὶ to come within and break it up. And in what follows, the fact that there was a temple of Clío sited opposite the shrine of Rhesus, was probably mentioned by Marsyas so that, however that might have come to be, it would serve to demonstrate that Clío was called *by some* the mother of Rhesus. And therefore, I take as proven the conclusions that Deiters (*Über die Verehrung der Musen bei den Griechen*, Bonn 1868 34:5) stated long ago and which Baegge (*cit.* 128) accepted: that the Muse was called Rhesus' mother mainly because that hero's sepulcher was located near the Muses' temple, and that Marsyas himself shared that view seems not improbable.

Now, even if it was because of the temple of Clío erected at Amphipolis that the *Rhesus* poet made the Muse Rhesus' mother, we still cannot conclude for certain that the Muse was

supposed by the Thracians themselves from the first to be this hero's mother; because the Muses' temple was erected by Greeks later on, the Greeks, that is, who in the second half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century bc founded the city of Amphipolis. In recent times

p. 41

a small statue of a woman has been found at Amphipolis<sup>124</sup> which Heuzey thought was by some disciple of Lysippus (fl. c. 350 bc), and resembled statues of the Muses. But there is nothing in this fact to make us doubt that the temple was erected in much earlier times, nor is it certain that the statue represents a Muse, nor, if that is granted, that this Muse has anything to do with the temple mentioned by Marsyas. Rather, I think it not improbable that in this temple some goddess was worshipped who belonged to earlier Thracian cult,<sup>125</sup> a goddess whom the Greeks called a Muse because of some resemblance between the representations of their Muses and that of this goddess; unless one thinks it more probable that the Greeks placed in this temple dedicated to a Thracian goddess a statue of Clio and offered sacrifices to it. However, since there is no reason for us to doubt that in Marsyas' own days Clio was worshipped in this temple, we can hardly contend that the writer himself was in error about it. But we can easily believe that the Thracians worshipped some Thracian goddess, in the temple Marsyas mentioned or elsewhere in the region of Amphipolis and considered her the mother of Rhesus. One might suspect she was Ciasa,<sup>126</sup> daughter of Ciasus, king of the Edones, whom the Greeks called Phyllis,<sup>127</sup> to judge from the scholia on Aeschines 2. 31 (T15). (For the story of Acamas and Phyllis, cf. also Tzetes on Lycophron 495, Bekker, An. 251). She may have been believed to be the mother of Rhesus in early times. It was with this heroine that Acamas--or in other traditions Demophon--the son of Theseus, returning from Troy, had a love affair; and when Acamas failed to return for her at the time appointed, Phyllis ran to the shores nine times to look for her lover borne in his ship from the heights, and each time, she was said to have cursed the Athenians to suffer a defeat, a total of nine, in that same place.<sup>128</sup> Because of this the region supposedly got its name of the *Ennea Hodoi*, the Nine Ways.<sup>129</sup>

p. 42

These "ancient myths" Aeschines (2.31, with scholion: T 15) proudly referenced to Philip II, king of Macedon, in proof of the Athenians' rights of property and territory in the region. And the Athenians made up the story and told it, that Demophon or Acamas had these relations with

<sup>124</sup> Heuzey-Daumet, *Mission archéologique de Macédoine*, Paris 1876, I. p. 168, II planchet 6.2. Reinach, *Répertoire de la statuère* II 1, Paris 1897, 303,2.

<sup>125</sup> As Adler suggested, *PW* XI 862, 46f: "this cult is surely Thracian and has only the name in common with the Muse (Clio)."

<sup>126</sup> cf. Tomaschek II. 2,48; Knaack, *Ro.* III 2486, 10ff.

<sup>127</sup> "Phyllis" was the eponymous heroine of the region of the same name on Pangaeus and near the Strymon; cf. Wilamowitz, *Sitzungsberichte* Berlin 1925, 49, 1. On the boundaries of this region see Herodotus 7.113.

<sup>128</sup> On these defeats of the Greeks, and particularly of the Athenians, see Thucydides 4. 102: Diodorus 12.68,2; schol. Aeschines 2.31 (T15); Münscher, *B.Ph. W.* 1920, 139ff; Bilabel, *Philologus* Supp. XIV 1, Leipzig 1921, 221.

<sup>129</sup> One can hardly doubt that the Thracian locale, in which later Amphipolis was founded by the Greeks, was known by a Thracian name and not *Ennea hodoi*, since this name is obviously Greek. Rather, it is likely that a Thracian name which in some way sounded like *Ennea hodoi* was changed into Greek. Thus Perdrizet (*Bull. corr. Hell.* 1922, 41) thought that it was the root of the name of the Odones (Edones), a root that appeared both in their name and in some Thracian word, which the Greeks changed into *Ennea hodoi*. Beloch (*Griech. Gesch.* II 1 1989 n. 1) conjectured that Brea was later called Amphipolis.

Phyllis, with this specific purpose, that they might appear to have a right to seek back the dowry of Theseus' daughter-in-law, as scholars have rightly understood.<sup>130</sup> Their arguments seemed relevant also to my own inquiry about the myth's origin, particularly given that in the same scholion there is the tradition that Phyllis and Demophon had a daughter—named Amphipolis! Knaack (Ro. III2486, 15) conjectured that Ciasa was that goddess native to Thrace that was most similar to the Greek Hecate, (which is relevant, considering that there was a significant tendency to syncretism between Artemis and Hecate-DA), and that there was a temple at Amphipolis or sepulcher or some other well-known trace of her presence is clear from an epigram of Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.705) in which in learned language it is said that there was a temple of "Aethopian Brauronia" (both words are epithets of Artemis) at Amphipolis. But this doubtful speculation about Rhesus' mother I think it is enough to have mentioned in passing.

### CHAPTER THREE

And now let us go on to the question of how it came to be that Rhesus was said to have been killed by Diomedes, a story first told in the *Doloneia*. For who would doubt that, in those fables which in German we call *Sagen*, in some way or other facts of actual history are present, difficult as it is to recover anything with certainty from stories of this kind?<sup>131</sup> So also, in the stories told of Rhesus slain by Diomedes, and the taking as booty of his far-famed horses, p. 43

Bethe (*Neue Jahrbücher* 7 1901, 660,664; *PW* V 818) has seen the wars of the Greek colonists with the Thracian inhabitants of the northern shores of the Aegean Sea in the area of Abdera. For (that other mythological Diomedes.) the Diomedes of Thrace,<sup>132</sup> whose man-eating horses were overcome along with their master by Hercules near Abdera, Bethe thinks was identical with Diomedes the son of Tydeus, who is mentioned by the author of *Iliad* 10 as fighting against the Thracians. For (Bethe believes) the battle did not take place in the Troad but should be located on the shores of Thrace, since Rhesus is called by Hipponax *Aeneiôn palmus*, king of the Aenei, and Diomedes of Abdera and the Ulysses who was a friend of Maron, king of Ismarus in Thrace, are his neighbors. Well, certainly Bethe was right to see the fable we are discussing as signifying battles between Thracians and some neighboring race of men hostile to them in the northern regions of the Aegean. But his idea about the Thracian Diomedes does not commend itself to me. For the Thracian Diomedes is the enemy of Hercules, who is a Greek hero.<sup>133</sup> But the Diomedes who is said to have slain Rhesus by the poet of the *Doloneia* (*Il.* 10.494), kills a Thracian, and he himself is supposed to be Greek. How can we suppose that he fights against a Thracian in Homer, but also fought against a Greek hero, Hercules, if he himself was Greek?

<sup>130</sup> Toepffer, *PW* I 1144-5; Knack, *PW* V 150, 62ff., Wilamowitz, SB Berlin 1925, 49.1.

<sup>131</sup> On this manner of inquiring into mythology there are good accounts by Bethe (NJB 7 1901, 661; 13, 1904, 10) and Wilamowitz, S. B. Berlin 1925, 57ff. Kroll, indeed (NJB 29 1912, 161-180), warns that only with the greatest diligence and caution can such inquiries be carried on, and I hope I have not neglected his warning.

<sup>132</sup> On this myth, see Robert (*Gr. Myth.* II 458-462), where he gives an excellent account and interpretation of the sources for it and also a review of scholarly opinions, so that I have considered it enough to give a short sketch of the elements in it that are most important for my own thesis.

<sup>133</sup> Euripides *Alcestis* 483ff, *Heracles* 380ff, Diodorus 4.15.3; other texts in Robert.

Besides, although scholars had held<sup>134</sup> that the outline of this labor of Hercules should be assigned to some other place of origin, but later on was (moved to Thrace and) connected with the foundation of (the city of) Abdera in Thrace, it is nowadays generally accepted that the origin of the full story of this labor belongs precisely to the times in which Abdera was founded (according to legend, in 654 bc, as a colony of Clazomenae) and owes its form to the colonizing expeditions and battles of its Greek founders.<sup>135</sup> For since Heracles is nowhere said to have conquered Diomedes and his horses in some other locale, and many of his other adventures take place in Thrace (Friedländer *cit.* 3ff), we cannot place it anywhere else. And Herodotus (1.168) says that Abdera was first founded

p.44

by Timesius of Clazomenae, whom later the Teians venerated as the hero-founder of the city, and then refounded by the Teians, who were fleeing subjection to the Persians. Now it is accepted that about 654 bc the Clazomenians colonized Abdera; and the Teians went here as (a second wave of) colonists in about 543 bc (Hirschfeld, *PW* I 22; Strack, *Nordgriechische Münzen* I 1, Berlin 1912, 4). The youth Abderus, who is said to have been beloved by Hercules,<sup>136</sup> and in whose memory, since he had been devoured by the horses of Diomedes, Hercules was said to have founded Abdera, appears in a fragment of Pindar as a hero in bronze armor, who is invoked as protector of the city.<sup>137</sup> From this it is rightly concluded that Abderus was the (earliest) hero-founder, *heros ktistês*, of Abdera (Jurenka 175; Wilamowitz *Sappho u. Simonides* 254). That fits well with Solinus 10.10: "Abdera, in the 31<sup>st</sup> Olympiad, had fallen into ruin with age, but the Clazomenii of Asia restored it to a better appearance, tearing down what had gone before<sup>138</sup> and claiming it as their own." The story that Abderus was devoured by the horses of Diomedes, Jurenka (176) claims, signifies that Abderus, after founding Abdera, died fighting, and the story that Diomedes was conquered (and killed) by Hercules (in revenge) signifies that the Greeks later won control of the city. I shall pass over Jurenka's theory that Hercules was really Melkart, and that there was a Phoenician port-city near Abdera, as it is unsupported by what we know of Phoenician history (cf. Strack 1. 2, 2.4; Friedländer 12). But, for our discussion, the passage of Pindar's Paean on the Abderites which concerns the foundation of Abdera, is of great importance; and though its text is badly damaged, its learned editors have made the gist of what Pindar says accessible to us:

A man must give to his parents great share of glory;  
they who through war obtained a land of fruitfulness,  
and established prosperity, after chasing away, casting

<sup>134</sup> Studniczka, *Kyrene*, Leipzig 1890, 137ff. and Ro. II 1735, 64; Wilamowitz *Heracles* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition Berlin 1909), 65, 30; Bethe *PW* V 817.

<sup>135</sup> Wilamowitz *Sappho u. Simonides* Berlin 1913, 254; Friedländer, *Heracles, Sagen- und geschichtliche Untersuchungen*, (*Phil. Unters.* 19), Berlin 1907, 3; Robert *Gr. Myth.* II 461.1.

<sup>136</sup> Hellanicus, fr. 135 (=Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀβδέρρα), Apollodorus 2.5, 7; Hyginus fab. 30; Strabo 7.331.44; Robert II 460, 1.

<sup>137</sup> Pindar, Paean 2 on the Abderites, *P. Oxy.* 841, vol. 5, 1908, p. 27ff, lines 1ff and 104ff; cf. von Arnim *Wiener Eranos*, Vienna 1909, 8-19; Jurenka, *Philologus* 71, 1912, 173-210; Sitzler, *Wochenschrift für Kl. Phil.* 1911, 586-590.

<sup>138</sup> Solinus says that Abdera was first founded and named by the sister of Diomedes, a story which Bethe, without giving arguments, says is older than that of Heracles' lover Abderus, *PW* V 817, 6ff.

out beyond A[thos], their divine nurse,<sup>139</sup>  
 the spear-bearing tribes of the Paionians;  
 p. 45  
 but then a dreadful fate came on them;  
 yet they persevered, and afterward, the gods joined to fulfill (their success):  
 for a man who performs a glorious work  
 is lit up by praises: upon them came  
 a very great light against their enemies,  
 before Melamphyllon... (Pindar, Paean 2 on the Abderites, 57-70)

Von Arnim refers this to the passage of Herodotus (1. 168) in which we are told that Timesius of Clazomenae, the founder of Abdera whom the barbarians drove out, was worshipped by the Teians, who had settled in Abdera a century, as their hero-founder. I like this interpretation of the passage very much, and so also does Sitzler (*loc. cit.* n. 136, 588). Because if we read it this way, the text of the paian and the scholium on line 65 (note 139) both now make sense.<sup>140</sup> The Abderites, who are said in v. 64ff to enjoy good fortune and defeat their enemies with the gods' help, are the same as those who a little before were said to have been expelled. To assume that the poet has merely made this a little difficult to understand seems reasonable enough. The other argument Jurenka (180, 11) brings, to refute von Arnim's reading, that *tokêes* are elsewhere always parents, and nowhere else is the word used to signify "ancestors," is certainly more weighty.

But even if *tokêes* are nowhere else "ancestors," it is still plausible that in this one place Pindar, by poetic license, has called the Clazomenian Abderite settlers the "parents" of the Teian Abderite settlers. For though Wilamowitz (249f) rightly says that the Clazomenians were in no way "ancestors" of (or even related to) the Teians, nonetheless they had occupied the place before the Teians arrived, and both were of the race of the Ionians.

Jurenka, however (180, 203) and Wilamowitz (249) take the words "they who through war." 63 ff., to refer to the Teians, and to describe some disaster that happened to them of which we find no mention in any other source. However that may be, this is the most important point: Pindar informs us that the ancestors, or fathers, or parents, of the Teians had driven the

---

<sup>139</sup> Von Arnim 15f. (with Wilamowitz's approval, *Sapph. u. Sim.* 246-50), was able to fill the lacuna with the name of A[thos], with the help of a scholion on vs. 65 in the margin: "having been cast out beyond Athos the inhabitants came back, defending themselves against those who had cast them out, and won." Jurenka's conjecture is *a[grîôn]*, following Grenfell and Hunt, and he assumes that the disaster spoken of was one that happened to the Teians, construing "cast out" to mean the Greek colonists. But the problem is, why should the Teians be cast "out beyond Athos," to the northwest? since it seems more plausible, they should have been thrown back to the sea and to the east, where they came from. And where did the scholiast get the word "Athos" unless this word was itself in the text? And thus, I would rather follow von Arnim than Jurenka here.

<sup>140</sup> The scholiast on *Od.* 7. 54 claims, annotating the word *τοκῆς*, "parents," that this and the word *πατέρες*, "fathers" are often used to signify "ancestors," and in saying that, he is trying to solve a discrepancy that arises from the fact that in this verse Alcinoos and Arête, the king and queen of Phaeacia, are said to be of the same "parents," whereas in the following verses Arête is said to be the daughter of Alcinoos' brother. But since it appears that those verses, 56ff., were added by some poet of a later generation (Kirchoff, *Homerische Odysee*, Berlin 1879, 79, 321; Ameis-Hentze on 7.54), we must suppose that Alcinoos and Arête are really siblings, and that *tokêes* means "parents" here as usual.



Paeonians out beyond Athos. Von Arnim (16) points out that it is no wonder that Pindar calls the Thracians whom the Abderites drove out “Paeonians.” Because those people live further up to the north and east; and it could easily be that some part of the Paeonian tribe lived in the countryside round Abdera—or that Pindar did not give them their right name. Wilamowitz (249f) adopts this alternative, holding that by the “Paeonians” Pindar meant the Bistones, not knowing the territory between Nestus and Axios well enough, nor the history of the (colonizing) expedition of the Clazomenians. But besides the difficulty I have in believing the idea that Pindar made a Paeon in honor of the Abderites with no real knowledge at all of their history, the Paeonians were Illyrians whom the Strymonians had driven out of *their* land, as we saw at p. 17-18 above. It is certainly more plausible that they were driven further still back to the east (where they came from). Herodotus (2.46) says that the Persians, with Megabazus as their general, subjugated the Perinthians who still remained in European Thrace, who earlier had had much trouble with the Paeonians; and that Bisto, the *heros-ktistês* of the Bistonians, the son of Ares and Callirhoe, was the brother of Odomas and Edon (the hero-founders of the Odomantes and Edoni). But we learn from Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. Βιστωνία that Bisto was said by others to have been the son of Paeon, the son of Ares. And Tomaschek (I 41) plausibly argues that that means that the Paeonians moved farther eastward as time went on. Now since from Pindar’s Paeon, and its scholion to line 65, we can know that both the Clazomenians and the Teians in setting up their colonies around Abdera found it necessary to fight the Paeonians, it is certainly likely that in the 7<sup>th</sup> century bc the Paeonians expelled the Clazomenians from Abdera. And probably the Dorian colonists, whom we can imagine are implied as trying to take over that territory (still earlier) by the myth of Hercules’ eighth labor, had fought with the Paeonians even earlier. Wilamowitz (254) and Robert (II 461) both supposed this Dorian expedition took place between the Clazomenians’ attempt (ca. 650) and that of the Teians (c.540); for since there is nothing in

p. 47

history about that, and yet Hercules is associated with Abdera, we might legitimately suppose that the expedition of the Dorians took place nearer the age of (the hero-founder) Abderus than the expedition of the Teians.<sup>141</sup> In that context it is important that Friedländer (3ff.; 21; 30. 12; 17; 136f) has tried to show that Hercules’ labors may well have been centered on Thrace, and that there is where the epic of the twelve labors may have centered. He believes that the story of Hercules and the Thracian Diomedes should be grouped with the other myths of Hercules that take place in or round Thrace, and that all these stories relate to colonizing expeditions by the Dorians and argues that all these Dorian tales arose in the parts of Asia Minor from which the earliest Greek colonists had come to Thrace. As for dating these Dorian expeditions, he thinks (21) that all of them took place before 700 bc.

Now if we base ourselves on these findings of Friedländer’s, we can construct a timetable of these events as follows. At the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> or the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> century bc, Abdera was founded by “Abderus,” or rather by men who considered him the protector and hero-founder of their city. Then the Dorians (Friedländer thinks, Rhodians) a little later, fought

---

<sup>141</sup> Strack (4), even if he does not think Abdera was founded even before the Clazomenians came, nonetheless refers the myth of Hercules (and the eighth labor) to a time earlier than that. Jurenka (177) thinks Abdera was founded in the days of “Aeolic migrations” by Greek colonists, and still earlier was a trading-city of the Phoenicians.

against Thracians allied with the Paeonians, who had expelled “Abderus” with his followers, or killed them, and won, and refounded the city, or, if the first attempt at foundation had been completely expunged, even “founded” it; but after a short while, the city was destroyed yet again by the same coalition of peoples. This city, yet again fallen into ruin, the Clazomenians re-occupied and tried to rebuild it; but they, once more, were driven out by the Paeonians. At last, in the 6<sup>th</sup> century, the Teians had the good luck to defeat the Paeonians and Thracians so completely that they could yet again refound Abdera and keep it from then on.

So then, the one myth, in which Abderus was killed by the horses of Diomedes (the Thracian), told of the death of the first founder, or of those who first tried to found Abdera. The next, the myth of Diomedes’ defeat at Hercules’ hands (in revenge for Abderus), and the taming of his man-eating horses, appears to signify the victory of the Dorians (over the Thracians), as the inhabitants of the regions told it. For that there was some regional hero who had sacred or divine horses, whom the barbarians worshipped, we can reasonably suspect, p. 48

a hero to whom the Greek colonists gave the name Diomedes, whether because some things which were narrated about this Illyrian hero reminded the Greeks of Diomedes the son of Tydeus, or because the actual names were similar.<sup>142</sup> Farnell, indeed, has recently held that in constructing the mythical character of Diomedes, the master of horses, the myths of the Illyrians may have had a role. He thinks the Illyrians were the first to identify Diomedes, the native hero of the Achaeans of Thessaly, with the legendary horses, and that through them the legend made its way to the Veneti and Daunii. I had myself long been thinking something like this: that the Diomedes who as Strabo tells us (5.215) was worshipped as a hero by the Veneti, an Illyrian people, was the same as the “Thracian” Diomedes of the Hercules legend. For both are heroes who delight in horses and whom the Greeks called Diomedes. The fact that Farnell, a great authority on Greek cult, thinks the horses of Diomedes originate among the Illyrians, seems to me valuable supporting evidence, which makes me more secure in supposing my idea that Diomedes was an Illyrian hero is not totally without foundation in truth. And for that reason, I have ventured to offer my own opinion about Diomedes, that he was an Illyrian hero, venturesome as it may be. So therefore, both the story of Diomedes the slayer of Rhesus and of Diomedes vanquished by Hercules, I would argue, refer to one and the same hero, indeed, but a hero native to Illyria and not Thrace.

So, it was by the migrations of the Illyrians that Diomedes arrived in the valley of the Strymon, and when the Paeonians, Illyrian by race, had expelled the Thracian Strymonians, the story that Rhesus the Thracian was overthrown by the hero of the Illyrians arose. But having defeated the Strymonians, the Paeonians drifted further to the east, and came into those conflicts with Greek colonists, from which the myth of the “Thracian” Diomedes and his feral horses and his death at the hands of Hercules arose. So, to sum it all up: the hero of the Illyrians, and the killer of Rhesus, and the adversary of Hercules’ (eighth labor), are all the same figure, and this figure the Greeks later named “Diomedes.”

---

<sup>142</sup> Farnell, *Greek hero cults and ideas of immortality*, Oxford 1921, 289-292 (on Diomedes) at 292. (Farnell points out that the name is entirely Greek and denotes a human being “counselled by Zeus,” 291, and identifies the Thracian and the Greek Diomedes exactly as here. —DA)

Now that this hero is called king of the Bistones, a Thracian tribe, is not surprising; for the Bistones, who lived around Abdera, may well have received the cult of Diomedes from the Paeonians, given that it seems likely that the Bistones had been conquered by them. Or if that seems less probable,

p.49

it could certainly have happened that some of the Paeonii, who worshipped Diomedes, had settled in the territory of the Bistones, and that the Greeks, given that only a small part of the territory of the Bistones was inhabited by Paeonians, called these worshippers of Diomedes Bistones also.

Finally, Tomaschek's view (I 41) of the Thracian Diomedes needs discussion. Tomaschek believes that what the myths tell us about Diomedes and his feral horses is to be referred to some prince of a Thracian tribe, like the Saii or the Sintii, who had lived in the lands of the Thracio-Phrygian Bistones. It is hard to find any really triumphant arguments to refute this view, but I feel that my own solution for Diomedes' identity as a hero of the Illyrians is closer to the truth. It should not be a Thracian hero who kills the Thracian hero Rhesus; that is less probable. You would have to believe that the difference between Thracians and Phrygo-Thracians was clearly discernible to all; and so indeed Tomaschek tried to argue it was. His proof does not entirely convince Kretschmer, 173, 212f. It seems to me that a move by the Strymonians to the east, to counter a migration of the Illyrians to the west, is more to the point.

It remains to inquire whether the Greeks first originated the story of Rhesus' death at the hands of Diomedes in their poetry, or the Thracians. Very little can be said with certainty about that, because we know next to nothing of Thracian poetry. But since there is no reason to deny that there were legends handed down among the barbarians as among the Greeks, legends which preserved very ancient traditions with some vividness, it is possible to suppose that the story of Rhesus' death at Diomedes' hands (in the *Doloneia*) was already familiar to the barbarians. If you believe the Greeks had made up many a similar story already, why should they not have put the stories they had learned from the barbarians into some similar form? Especially since we know that already, in the 8<sup>th</sup> century bc, a number of Greeks had reached the northern shores of the Aegean. So, these stories were referred by the Greeks to Diomedes the son of Tydeus, and also some Homeric rhapsode took the story of Rhesus' murder by Diomedes into the *Iliad*. The rest of the features we find narrated in the *Doloneia* were added by the *Doloneia* poet himself, and in constructing them it seems probable enough that he had vividly in his mind actual battles between Greek colonists and the barbarians who inhabited Thrace.<sup>143</sup>

p. 50

And since we must now arrive, at last, at the point where we can inquire what Rhesus' true nature was, first let us investigate what race he was of from the beginning. In this matter, since, as we have said above (p. 15, 26), his memory flourished above all in the neighborhood of Amphipolis, the area special most of all to the Edones,<sup>144</sup> we will hardly be wrong to suspect

<sup>143</sup> And so Wilamowitz has very plausibly conjectured (*Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin 1916, 62-3); cf. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1923, 563.

<sup>144</sup>Cf. Thuc. 4.102 and Diodorus 12.68.2, where we find that the Athenians in founding Amphipolis had to fight the Edones.

that he originated as a cult-hero of the Edones. Now, though Rohde has already seen this (*Psyche* I.161,2), his view that he was the god of that people seems to go too far (and in this matter Leaf, 3f., rightly criticized Rohde). None of our evidence makes Rhesus a god. For in well-measured words the Muse, in the tragedy *Rhesus*, prophesies that her son will now be as one dead to her:

And as one dead who cannot see the light  
he shall be to me from now on: for never shall he  
come out to meet me, nor see his mother's body,  
but hidden in caves of the silver-veined earth  
he shall lie here, an *anthrôpodaimôn*...(967-71)

Were Rhesus truly a god, how could the Muse have proclaimed his survival in words so narrowly circumscribed? Again, the word *anthrôpodaimôn* in this context must mean a human being turned into a *daimôn*, not a *daimôn* endowed with a human body; this sense is attested for the word by Procopius (ap. Suidas s.v. *anthrôpodaimones*), and Stephanus (Étienne) gives this meaning in his *Thesaurus* I. 781 (see also Perdrizet, 29,1). For again, how could the Muse say that she will ask Proserpine to set Rhesus' soul free from Hades (to play this role), were Rhesus an immortal god? Therefore, we must stoutly deny that the *Rhesus* poet believed Rhesus was a god, nor do our passages from Marsyas (the younger), Polyaeus and Philostratus assign him the status of a god.

But Rhesus in various places (*Il.* 10.435, Strabo 7.331,36) is expressly said to have been a king of the Thracians, and in all our *testimonia* he is portrayed as a royal leader, nor does he exhibit any trait which prevents us from conceiving him as a native king. In this matter we should emphasize Conon, *Narrationes* 4, where Rhesus is called the son of Strymon, a king of the Thracians,

p.51

and Strymon, we saw above (p. 15), was still worshipped as a river-god in the days of Philip II of Macedon. The results we obtain from these facts appear to me to be as follows: that Rhesus was a king, by birth, of the Thracians, who was made a hero after his death, and who was believed by the Thracians to dwell in a cave at Amphipolis and enjoyed a hero-cult there and in other places. Sittig (*PW* IA 629ff), who believed that Rhesus was a native *daimôn* dwelling in the ground, thought that perhaps we should assume that Diomedes, the lord of the man-eating horses, so far as his hero-cult went, was the antitype of Rhesus, the most benevolent lord of the white horses; yet the evidence by which we could support this conjecture, as he himself notes, is not convincing. Jessen (*Ro.* IV 100) thinks that the whole story of Diomedes as victorious over Rhesus was invented by Diomedes' own hero-worshippers, to degrade the cult of Rhesus and forward that of Diomedes. But though Jessen was right to judge that this myth signifies the triumph of Diomedes' cult-worshippers, there is nothing in the myth to explain a change in Rhesus' cult. For if we claim that the myth signifies some battle between the Thracian peoples whose hero was Diomedes and those whose hero was Rhesus, that seems enough to explain it perfectly; nor do we have any trace of a cult of Rhesus at Abdera, nor of a

cult of Diomedes at Amphipolis. Also, Sittig's opinion that Rhesus was from the first believed by the Thracians to be an earth-*daimôn* seems to me to be impossible, because if one accepts it, then the opinions of Rhesus' worshippers seem to have fluctuated too greatly. And indeed the poets will first have changed Rhesus, a *daimôn* by birth, into a mere human warrior, and then decided to change him back into a cult-hero inhabiting a cave. Much simpler, and much better suited to our evidence, is this explanation: Rhesus, a king of the Thracians, after his death was believed by the Thracians to have become a hero; and as we saw (p. 26) the very name "Rhesus" looks like proof that he was a (merely human) king. And then, as far as Rhesus' being an immortal, the conceptions and opinions of the Thracians are of great weight in this argument. The most celebrated example is that we find in Herodotus' account of Zalmoxis, nor have there been lacking scholars to compare this "hero" or "god" with Rhesus. Both live in a cave. Both have healing powers. Both hunt. Now, these properties are common to nearly all cult-heroes (cf. Deneken, Ro. I 2441ff, Eitrem *PW* VIII 1111ff.).

p. 52

And so, from the comparison with Zalmoxis we learn nothing new or peculiar to Rhesus. However, if horses, hunting and armed combat are things Rhesus was supposedly fond of, then Jessen (Ro. IV 110ff) rightly judged that the Thracians assigned their own favorite things to their hero, so that even from this we can recognize Rhesus as a born and bred Thracian hero.

So, to sum up, I consider the following quite certain: Rhesus, a king of the Thracians, as the Thracians themselves believed, was made a hero after his death, who dwelt in a cave located at Amphipolis on the Strymon. As a Thracian, those very things were assigned to him as characteristic which the Thracians themselves most enjoyed and delighted in. But I feel we must deny that he was one of their gods.

#### Chapter 4: CONCLUSION

And now I shall attempt to delineate the entire myth of Rhesus in brief; and at the same time it will be equally relevant here to sum up that which was invented by poets of later date, as novelties to be added to the ancient Thracian fable.

Rhesus, then, was thought to be a king of the Thracians, the son of Strymon. The Thracians believed that after his death he was made a hero and inhabited a cave at Amphipolis, and that on Mt. Rhodope, near the dwellings of the Edones, where perhaps even when alive he had enjoyed being a hunter, he was worshipped as a hero and hunter. His tradition was spread through the migration of Thracian tribes closely connected to the Edones, perhaps first to Aenaea or Aenus, then to Asia Minor (pp. 16, 19 above). These migrations appear to have been at least partly caused by an attack by the Illyrian Paeones on the tribes near the Strymon. Now, when the Paeones had expelled most of the original inhabitants of the Strymon valley (but not all of them, for even long after this attack by the Paeonians Rhesus' memory was kept up in the Strymon valley), the Thracians invented a new myth that Rhesus their hero, or king, had been killed by the Illyrian Paeones. Also, Hercules was said to have quarreled with a cult-hero,

or king, of the Paeonians, one who perhaps had brought the Bistones under his sway, and thus enjoyed a hero-cult even among the Bistones themselves. By this story memories were preserved of battles between the Greek colonists of Abdera and the Illyrian and Thracian natives of those parts.

p. 53

This hero of the Paeonians, because his character was like that of the Greek hero Diomedes, was called “the Thracian Diomedes” by the Greeks. And thus, the myth of the Thracian hero Rhesus, killed by the “Thracian” Diomedes, already familiar to the barbarians, came to affect the stories of Diomedes the son of Tydeus, in the same way in which the myth of Diomedes the adversary of Hercules was received as part of the Iliadic tradition. This tradition about the Greek Diomedes the son of Tydeus came to influence the author of (*Iliad* 10,) the *Doloneia*, who perhaps had directly in mind battles in his own day between the Greek colonists and the Thracian natives (cf. p. 40 above). From the times of the *Doloneia*-poet onward, the story of Rhesus as an ally of the Trojans who was killed by Diomedes became familiar to the Greeks and was so widespread that the Thracian origins of the story were almost completely obscured. Indeed, we would be unable to unearth these origins, had the author of the tragedy *Rhesus* not known of them and added in from the original Thracian story a number of important items, as Wilamowitz has recently shown (*Hom. Untersuchungen* 413). And even in writers of a still later date, who had reliable traditions and sources for what they say, we can discover evidence of Rhesus’ true origin and birth.

But certainly the tragic poet himself added into the story some novelties, of which the most important—a detail of which we can find no trace in older authors—is that the mother of Rhesus, whom the original Thracians probably believed to be some goddess or heroine of their own (perhaps named Ciasa), was first said by him to be a Muse. Since the tragic poet does not give her a name, the writers of later times offered differing opinions on which of the Muses was to be seen as Rhesus’ mother (above, 38ff). Also, in the tragedy there are new details about why or how this or that aspect of the plot was there or should be understood. Steiger (*Euripides, seine Dichtung u. seine Persönlichkeit*, Leipzig 1912, 93f.) has listed these novelties. Hector (406 ff) glories in having himself made Rhesus a king in Thrace, when he began as some obscure chieftain. That certainly makes it clearer why Rhesus was obliged to come and help the Trojans in their war with the Greeks. Again, the speech of Rhesus detailing his wars with the Scythians, which he offers as excuse for not having come earlier to the Trojans’ aid, is probably the tragic poet’s invention.<sup>145</sup> Unless these details too come from the myths of the Thracians and allegorize their own adventures while migrating from the Strymon valley into Asia Minor.

---

<sup>145</sup> And certainly at the end of the tragedy (930ff.) no mention is made of Rhesus’ being indebted to Hector (for his achieving kingly status in Thrace).

p. 54

But since Rhesus is said in Homer, and Hipponax, and in the tragedy, to have been killed at Troy, it is no wonder that the Greeks assumed he was buried there. That is testified in the verses I cited from the "*Peplum* of Aristotle," fr. 56 Diehl (cf. p. 14 above). Compare *Rhesus* 880 ff., 959-961 (where he is offered a grave at Troy by Hector, but the Muse has other ideas). Polyaeus, or whoever he is following, also believed Rhesus had been buried at Troy.

Now, that Rhesus was killed at Troy after having done next to nothing worthy of a hero<sup>146</sup> was considered too degrading to him by various poets. Some pictured him as having fought one whole day, at least, against the Greeks, and so utterly routed and put them to flight that Hera was terrified that the Greeks might lose the war forthwith, and made Athena promise to incite Odysseus and Diomedes to do something to put down this troublesome Thracian.<sup>147</sup> Pindar alluded to this version of the story (fr. 181), as we learn from the scholiasts (who preserve this fragment: ABT on *Il.* 10.435, cf. Eusthatus *ad loc.*). Indeed Schol. A even says that an oracle was given to Rhesus, that if he and his horses drank the water of the Scamander, he would be unconquerable. It appears that the verses of Virgil, *Aen.* 1. 469ff., describing a picture of Diomedes killing Rhesus (which has just been painted on the walls of Dido's new temple of Juno), refer to this story: *illic tentoria Rhesi*, "and there (Aeneas sees) the tents of Rhesus,

and (Diomedes) turns the fiery horses towards the camps

(of the Achaeans) before they had tasted the fodder of Troy

or had drunk the water of Xanthus

Servius' note here says "the horses are stolen *on which the fate of Troy depended*, so that if they were to taste of Trojan fodder or drink of the water of Xanthus, a river of Troy, then Troy could not perish."<sup>148</sup> The author of our tragedy apparently knows this also, though in general he chose rather to follow Homer than Pindar, because he makes Athena say

If (Rhesus) gets through this night and lasts till tomorrow

not even Achilles, nor the spear of Ajax

---

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Philostratus, *Heroicus* 148.22ff: "(Rhesus) who did nothing felicitous at Troy, nor even appeared to be worthy of mention for anything but his white horses."

<sup>147</sup> Hera is brought on at *Iliad* 5.311 and at 8. 350ff. attempting to help the Greeks in this way; and these passages the author of the "alternate prologue" to the *Rhesus*, (preserved in the Scholia to line 1L twelve lines evidently spoken by Hera to Athena to enlist her help against Rhesus) appears to have had before his eyes. The Scholia's source believes that this "second prologue" (which the scholion says is "very prosy, and unbecoming of Euripides") was made up by actors. But note that Parthenius (fable 36) says that Rhesus died (actively) fighting, *makhomenon*.

<sup>148</sup> See also Servius on *Aen.* 2.13 *fracti bello fatisque repulsi* (the Greeks' conquest of Troy was retarded by war and by fate: Servius' note lists various oracles, one of which was *ut Rhesi equi tollerentur a Graecis*, that the horses of Rhesus must be stolen by the Greeks.)

can stop him destroying the Greeks' whole anchorage...(600-602)

p.55

And as far as concerns the rivers which bore Rhesus' name, and the story of Parthenius 36 (above, p. 16ff), I believe it probable that Rhesus' cult-observances spread with the migrations of the Thracians themselves into Bithynia and the Troad. The story of Rhesus' and Arganthon's love (above. p. 23ff) obviously was made up by some later poet, who was thinking, perhaps, that by this myth some kind of union (of the Thracians) with the Mysi and Bithynii was signified. As for Rhesus' prowess as a hunter, made much of by both Philostratus and Parthenius, that suits with the national character of the Thracians, as we say above (p. 52).

Finally, that Rhesus was the son of Ares is something Servius tells us was the theory of several writers, in his note on *Aeneid* 1.469, discussed above (p. 16). Jessen (Ro. IV 107, 7ff) seems to me right in conjecturing that Servius in writing this was thinking above all of *Geo.* 4.462, *altaque Pangaea et Rhesi Mavortia tellus*, "lofty Pangaea and Rhesus' Mars-born land." Jessen thinks that it could be that Rhesus in more ancient times was considered "the son of Mars" in real truth, and certainly there is no denying that the cult of Ares was important to Thrace; but I don't agree. For even though Ares may have been a Thracian god by origin (cf. the notes of Ameis-Hentze on *Odyssey* 4.439), nonetheless we have it in all our ancient *testimonia* that the Strymon was Rhesus' father. So I believe, and with some degree of certainty, that a poet of some much later age may have invented as a novelty the touch that the god Ares was the father of Rhesus, just as he is also said to have been the father of the "Thracian" Diomedes – see Euripides, *Alcestis* 498, Apollodorus 2.5, 7--as distinguished from the *Iliad's* Diomedes, the son of Tydeus. But whether we take Diomedes to be the "Thracian" Diomedes and a native of Illyria, or to be one and the same with the son of Tydeus, Jessen's idea cannot stand.

In closing, I cannot omit the fact that the story of Rhesus' death appears only rarely in vase-paintings (Jessen, Ro. IV 104; Robert *Gr. Myth.* II 1188,5). But it is entirely worth our notice that Rhesus in every one of these is wearing Thracian garb and Thracian trousers, as befits his Thracian origin.





Johannes Rempe around the time of his dissertation

#### VITA

I, Hermann Josef Johannes Rempe, was born July 5th, 1903, to my father Heinrich (Rempe) and my mother Antonie, née Marre, in the town of Borbeck, now united in one city with Essen (Lat. Assindia) as Essen-Borbeck. I profess the Catholic faith. After my primary education I spent nine years at the Borbeck Gymnasium. Having received my diploma there in the spring of 1922, I entered [the Albert-Ludwig] University, Freiburg, to be a student of philology, history and

philosophy. After six months I moved to Munich, where for eighteen months I was a member of the [Ludwig Maximilian] University. Then for twenty-four months I did all my work at [the University of] Münster. My learned teachers were: Aly, Deubner (now at Berlin), Geyser (now at Munich), Immisch and Sütterlin, all these at Freiburg; Bäumker (deceased), Becher, Borchardt, Kapp, Kehrer, Maurenbrecher, M. Meier, Muncker, Oncken, Otto, Pfänder, Rehm, Schwartz, Vollmer (deceased), Weyman, Wolff, and Wolters, all these at Munich; O. Hoffmann, Münscher, Münzer, de Salis, Schöne, Sonnenburg, Spannagel, Voigt, Vorländer, and Wätjen, all these at Münster. Deubner, Rehm, Schwartz, Kapp, Münscher, Schöne, and Sonnenburg admitted me to their seminars with other students in philology over three years; Otto, Münzer, and Spannagel kindly accepted me to study in their seminars in history; and de Salis gave me a place in his archaeology seminar, Münscher in his seminar on metre.

I feel great gratitude to all these men, and especially to Karl Münscher, at whose direction I undertook to write this work, and with whose help I was able to complete it.

(Translator's note: Karl Münscher (1871-1936), a student of F. Leo and of Wilamowitz, was the author of *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur*, *Philologus* Suppl. 13.2, 1920, *Senecas Werke: Untersuchungen zur Abfassungszeit u. Echtheit*, *Philologus* Suppl. 16.1, Leipzig 1922, and many articles.)

Rempe's family have given me the following account of his life after his University studies:

"After receiving his doctorate and qualifying himself as a teacher, Dr. Johannes Rempe taught Latin, Greek, history, and physical education at several high schools (gymnasia) in Westphalia. Interrupted in his teaching duties by the second World War, he served as draftee (with the rank of private) in the German army of occupation in Norway from 1943 to 1945. In 1950 he was promoted to deputy principal of the Gymnasium Paulinum in Münster. From 1955 until his retirement in 1968 he served as principal (Direktor) of the Gymnasium Laurentianum in Warendorf.

He authored an introductory text book, *Disciplina Latina* (Aschendorff, 1953), and edited text selections with commentaries from Livy's "Ab urbe condita" and Xenophon's "Memorabilia" and "Cyropaedia" for use by high school students and teachers.

In 1934, Dr. Rempe married Lidwine Scheifes. Their union produced five children: one attorney, two teachers, one musical conductor, and one cellist. Dr. Rempe died March 15, 1977."

Appendix: some texts discussed in *De Rheso Thracum Heroe*

T1, 1a

Iliad 10. 433-441 (Dolon speaking)

ἀλλὰ τί ἢ ἐμὲ ταῦτα διεξερέεσθε ἕκαστα;  
εἰ γὰρ δὴ μέματον Τρώων καταδῦναι ὄμιλον  
Θρήϊκες οἶδ' ἀπάνευθε νεήλυδες ἔσχατοι ἄλλων:  
ἐν δέ σφιν Ῥῆσος βασιλεὺς πάϊς Ἡϊονῆος. 435  
τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον ἡδὲ μεγίστους:  
λευκότεροι χιόνος, θείειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι:  
ἄρμα δέ οἱ χρυσῷ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳ εὖ ἥσκηται:  
τεύχεα δὲ χρύσεια πελώρια θαῦμα ιδέσθαι

ἦλυθ' ἔχων: τὰ μὲν οὖν τι καταθνητοῖσιν ἔοικεν 440

ἄνδρεσσιν φορέειν, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν.

"But why tell you all this, complete and in detail?

for if you two are eager to go into the Trojans' camp

the Thracians, newcomers, camp far away from the others,

and among them Rhesos their king, the son of Eioneus,

and I saw his horses, most beautiful and big,

whiter than snow and like the wind when they run,

and his chariot beautifully worked with gold and silver,

and his great golden armor, a wonder to see

that he brought with him, that seems too much for a mortal man to wear, but fit for the immortal gods."

a. Hipponax fr. 41 Diehl=72

ἐπ' ἰάρματων τε καὶ Θρεϊκίων πώλων (5)

λευκῶν ἰστίους κατεγγυῖς Ἰλίου πύργων

ἄπληναρίσθη Ῥῆσος, Αἰνείων πάλμυς

...on chariots and white Thracian ponies

...near the towers of Ilium,

Rhesus the king of the Ainaians

was (slain and) stripped of his armor...

## T2

Parthenius, *Love Romances* 6

From Theagenes<sup>19</sup> and the *Palleniaca* of Hegesippus<sup>20</sup>

The story is told that Pallene was the daughter of Sithon, king of the Odomanti,<sup>21</sup> and was so beautiful and charming that the fame of her went far abroad, and she was sought in marriage by wooers not only from Thrace, but from still more distant parts, such as from Illyria and those that lived on the banks of the river Tanais. At first Sithon challenged all who came to woo her to fight with him for the girl, with the penalty of death in case of defeat, and in this manner caused the destruction of a considerable number. But later on, when his vigour began to fail him, he realized that he must find her a husband, and when two suitors came, Dryas and Clitus, he arranged that they should fight one another with the girl as the prize of victory; the vanquished was to be killed, while the survivor was to have both her and the kingship. When the day appointed for the battle arrived, Pallene (who had fallen deeply in love with Clitus) was terribly afraid for him: she dared not tell what she felt to any of her companions, but tears coursed down and down over her cheeks until her old tutor<sup>22</sup> realized the state of affairs, and, after he had become aware of her passion, encouraged her to be of good cheer, as all would come about according to her desires: and he went off and suborned the chariot-driver of Dryas, inducing him, by the promise of a heavy bribe, to leave undone the pins of his chariot-wheels. In due course the combatants came out to fight: Dryas charged Clitus, but the wheels of his

chariot came off, and Clitus ran upon him as he fell and put an end to him. Sithon came to know of his daughter's love and of the stratagem that had been employed; and he constructed a huge pyre, and, setting the body of Dryas upon it, proposed to slay Pallene at the same time<sup>23</sup>; but a heaven-sent prodigy occurred, a tremendous shower bursting suddenly from the sky, so that he altered his intention and, deciding to give pleasure by the celebration of marriage to the great concourse of Thracians who were there, allowed Clitus to take the girl to wife.

(from Edmonds and Gaselee, Loeb Parthenius, 1916)

19. An early logographer and grammarian. This story may well come from the *Makedonika* we know him to have written.

20. Of Mecyberna, probably in the third century B.C. For a full discussion of his work and date see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.

21. A people living on the lower Strymon in north-eastern Macedonia.

22. Literally a male nurse. We have no exact equivalent in English.

23. Presumably as an offering to the shade of Dryas, for whose death Pallene had been responsible.

### T3

From Photius' *Bibliotheca: Narrationes*, Conon fab. 10

§ 10 The tenth, how Sithon the son of Poseidon and Ossa, was king of the Thracian Chersonesos. He had a daughter Pallene with the nymph Mendeis. Since she had many suitors, he made his daughter and his kingdom the prize to the victor in battle against him. So Merops the king of Anthemousia and Periphetes of Mygdonia are killed contending for the marriage. So then Sithon decrees that the suitors will not fight him but each other, with the same prize to the victor. Now Dryas and Klitos compete, and Dryas falls through Pallene's cheating. When this was detected, Sithon was about to condemn Pallene to death, had not Aphrodite by consorting with (appearing to?) ἐπιφοιτήσασα + dat. DA) all the citizens at night snatched the girl from death. And when the father died Pallene and Klitos inherited the kingdom, and from her the country took the name Pallene.--- [https://topostext.org/work.php?work\\_id=489](https://topostext.org/work.php?work_id=489); Greek text and French tr. at [remacle.org](http://remacle.org)

### T4

Conon, *Narrations* fab. 32

§ 32 The 32nd, about Europa the daughter of Phoinix, who disappears, and so the father sent his sons to look for their sister, one of whom was Kadmos, and Proteus of Egypt goes with him, fearing the reign of Bousiris. And how, after much wandering and finding nothing they end up in Pallene, and how Proteus hosted Klitos and became his friend (Klitos was a wise and just king of the Sithonians, a Thracian ethnos). Proteus married his

daughter Chrysonoe. And when the Bisaltians were driven out of their land by the war. Klitos and Proteus fought against them, Proteus ruled over the country. But he had children not like himself but instead crude lawbreakers, whom Herakles, who hated evildoers, killed. And their father heaped a mound of dirt over them and cleansed Herakles (who was polluted by this bloodshed) of the murder.

## T5

Conon *Narrationes* fab. 4:

§ 4 Now then, the fourth narrative talks about Olynthos the city and Strymon, who ruled the Thracians and gave his name to the river formerly known as Eioneus.

He had three sons, Brangas and Rhessos (*sic*) and Olynthos. Rhessos went to fight alongside Priam at Troy and was killed by Diomedes. Olynthos confronted a lion in a hunt and died. Brangas his brother mourned the misfortune greatly and buried Olynthos where he fell. Then coming to Sithonia he built a great and prosperous city, which he named Olynthos after the boy.

## T6

Polyaenus, *Strategems* 6.53

Hagnon intended to plant an Attic colony at that part of the river Strymon which is called Nine-Ways (*Ennea Hodoi*). But the following oracle appeared to warn against the attempt:

" Athenians, why of late attempt to raise  
The structure proud, and colonise Nine-Ways?  
Vain the attempt, unauthorised by Heaven;  
Dire the decree, that rigid Fate has given  
Against the deed; till from the silent tomb  
At Troy the carcass of old Rhesus come  
To join its parent soil. Then, then proceed;  
And Fate shall render it a glorious deed. "

As a result of this message from the god, Hagnon dispatched some men to Troy, to open up the grave of Rhesus by night, and carry away his bones. They wrapped his bones up in a purple robe and brought them to the river Strymon. However, the barbarians, who inhabited the country, would not permit him to cross the river. Hagnon, who was not able to force his way across the river, concluded a truce with them for three days. They retired to their own homes, and left him in peace, for the time stipulated between them. In the night he crossed the Strymon with his army. He carried with him the bones of Rhesus, which he buried by the side of the river; and there he defended himself with a ditch and palisades. He rested during the day and worked on the fortifications every night; and within three nights, his defensive works were completed. When the barbarians returned and found what he had been doing during their absence, they accused him of infringing the truce. "I am certainly not guilty of that," replied Hagnon. "The truce was to remain inactive for three days, and I observed it religiously. The defensive works, which you see,

were erected in the intervening nights." This was the origin of the city, which Hagnon built on the Nine-Ways, and he called it Amphipolis. Tr: Shepherd, 1793, alt.

## T7

Thucydides 4.102-8

**102.** The same winter (425/4 bc), Brasidas with his confederates in Thrace made war upon Amphipolis, a colony of the Athenians, situated on the river Strymon. [2] The place whereon the city now stands, Aristagoras of Miletus had formerly attempted to inhabit, when he fled from king Darius, but was beaten away by the Edonians. Two-and-thirty years after this, the Athenians assayed the same, and sent thither ten thousand of their own city, and of others as many as would go; and these were all destroyed by the Thracians at Drabescus (465). [3] In the twenty-ninth year after (437/6), conducted by Hagnon, the son of Nicias, the Athenians came again, and having driven out the Edonians, became founders of this place, formerly called the Nine Ways. His army lay then at Eion, a town of traffic by the seaside subject to the Athenians, at the mouth of the river Strymon, five-and twenty furlongs from the city. Hagnon named this city Amphipolis because it was surrounded by the river Strymon, that runs on either side it. When he had taken it in with a long wall from river to river, he put inhabitants into the place, which was conspicuous round about both to the sea and land.

**103.** Against this city marched Brasidas with his army, dislodging from Arnae in Chalcidea. Being about twilight come as far as Aulon and Bromiscus, where the lake Bolbe enters into the sea, he caused his army to sup, and then marched forward by night. [2] The weather was foul, and it snowed a little, which also made him to march the rather, as desiring that none of Amphipolis, but only the traitors, should be aware of his coming. [3] For there were both Argilians that dwelt in the same city (Argilus is a colony of the Andrians), and others, that contrived this, induced thereto some by Perdiccas and some by the Chalcideans. [4] But above all the Argilians, being of a city near unto it, and ever suspected by the Athenians, and secret enemies to the place, as soon as opportunity was offered and Brasidas arrived (who had also long before dealt underhand with as many of them as dwelt in Amphipolis to betray it), received him into their own city, and revolting from the Athenians, brought the army forward the same night as far as to the bridge of the river. [5] The town stood not close to the river, nor was there a fort at the bridge then as there is now; but they kept it only with a small guard of soldiers. Having easily forced this guard, both in respect of the treason and of the weather, and of his own unexpected approach, he passed the bridge and was presently master of whatsoever the Amphipolitans had that dwelt without, and some fled into the city. **104.** Having thus suddenly passed the bridge, and many of those without being slain, and some fled into the city, the Amphipolitans were in very great confusion at it; and the rather because they were jealous one of another. [2] And it is said that if Brasidas had not sent out his army to take booty, but had marched presently to the city, he had in all likelihood taken it then. But so it was that he pitched there and fell upon those without; [3] and seeing nothing succeeded by those within, lay still upon the place.[4] But the contrary faction to the traitors being superior in number, whereby the gates were not opened presently, both they and Eucles the general, who was then there for the Athenians to keep the town,



sent unto the other general, Thucydides, the son of Olorus, the writer of this history, who had charge in Thrace, and was now about Thasos (which is an island and a colony of the Parians, distant from Amphipolis about half a day's sail), requiring him to come and relieve them. [5] When he heard the news, he went thitherwards in all haste with seven galleys, which chanced to be with him at that time. His purpose principally was to prevent the yielding up of Amphipolis; but if he should fail of that, then to possess himself of Eion [before Brasidas' coming].

**105.** Brasidas, in the meantime, fearing the aid of the galleys to come from Thasos, and having also been informed that Thucydides possessed mines of gold in the parts of Thrace thereabouts, and was thereby of ability amongst the principal men of the continent, hasted by all means to get Amphipolis before he should arrive, lest otherwise at his coming the commons of Amphipolis, expecting that he would levy confederates both from the sea-side and in Thrace, and relieve them, should thereupon refuse to yield. [2] And to that end offered them a moderate composition, causing to be proclaimed that whosoever, Amphipolitan or Athenian, would, might continue to dwell there and enjoy his own, with equal and like form of government; and that he that would not, should have five days' respite to be gone and carry away his goods.

**106.** When the commons heard this, their minds were turned; and the rather, because the Athenians amongst them were but few, and the most were a promiscuous multitude; and the kinsmen of those that were taken without flocked together within. And in respect of their fear, they all thought the proclamation reasonable; the Athenians thought it so because they were willing to go out, as apprehending their own danger to be greater than that of the rest, and withal, not expecting aid in haste; and the rest of the multitude, as being thereby both delivered of the danger, and withal to retain their city with the equal form of government. [2] Insomuch that they which conspired with Brasidas now openly justified the offer as reasonable; and seeing the minds of the commons were now turned and that they gave ear no more to the words of the Athenian general, they compounded, and upon the conditions proclaimed received him. [3] Thus did these men deliver up the city. Thucydides with his galleys arrived in the evening of the same day at Eion. [4] Brasidas had already gotten Amphipolis and wanted but a night of taking Eion also; for if these galleys had not come speedily to relieve it, by next morning it had been had.

**107.** After this Thucydides secured Eion, so as it should be safe both for the present, though Brasidas should assault it, and for the future; and took into it such as, according to the proclamation made, came down from Amphipolis. [2] Brasidas with many boats came suddenly down the river to Eion and attempted to seize on the point of the ground lying out from the wall into the sea, and thereby to command the mouth of the river; he assayed also the same at the same time by land and was in both beaten off; but Amphipolis he furnished with all things necessary. [3] Then revolted to him Myrcinus, a city of the Edonians, Pittacus, the king of the Edonians, being slain by the sons of Goaxis and by Braures his own wife. And not long after Gapselus also, and Oesyne, colonies of the Thasians. Perdiccas also, after the taking of these places, came to him and helped him in assuring of the same.

Tr. Hobbes, Bohn ed. 1843 (alt.)

## T8

Parthenius 36: THE STORY OF ARGANTHONE

From the first book of the *Bithyniaca* of Asclepiades of Myrlea

(Asclepiades: a grammarian, who probably lived at Pergamum in the first century B.C.)

Rhesus, so the story goes, before he went to help Troy, travelled over many countries, subduing them and imposing contributions; and in the course of his career he came to Cius, in Bithynia, attracted by the fame of a beautiful woman called Arganthon. She had no taste for indoor life and staying at home, but she got together a great pack of hounds and used to hunt, never admitting anybody to her company. When Rhesus came to this place, he made no attempt to take her by force; he professed to desire to hunt with her, saying that he, like her, hated the company of men; and she was delighted at what he said, believing that he was speaking the truth. After some considerable time had passed, she fell deeply in love with him: at first, restrained by shame, she would not confess her affection; but then, her passion growing stronger, she took courage to tell him, and so by mutual consent he took her to wife. Later on, when the Trojan war broke out, the princes on the Trojan side sent to fetch him as an ally; but Arganthon, either because of her very great love for him, or because she somehow knew the future, would not let him go. But Rhesus could not bear the thought of becoming soft and unwarlike by staying at home. He went to Troy, and there, fighting at the river now called Rhesus after him, was wounded by Diomed and died. Arganthon, when she heard of his death, went once more to the place where they had first come together, and wandering about there called unceasingly "Rhesus, Rhesus"; and at last, refusing all meat and drink because of the greatness of her grief, passed away from among mankind.

## T9

(Appian, *Mithridatic Wars* 1.1)

[1] The Greeks think that the Thracians who marched to the Trojan War with Rhesus, who was killed by Diomedes in the nighttime in the manner described in Homer's poems, fled to the outlet of the Euxine sea, at the place where the crossing to Thrace is shortest. Some say that as they found no ships they remained there and possessed themselves of the country called Bebrycia. Others say that they crossed over to the country beyond Byzantium called Thracian Bithynia and settled along the river Bithya, but were forced by hunger to return to Bebrycia, to which they gave the name of Bithynia from the river where they had previously dwelt; or perhaps the name was changed by them insensibly with the lapse of time, as there is not much difference between Bithynia and Bebrycia. So some think. Others say that their first ruler was Bithys, the son of Zeus and Thrace, and that the two countries received their names from them.



T10 (*Iliad* 13. 3-7, with Porphyry's note)

(Zeus) himself turning his bright pair of eyes

to distant lands, those of the Thracians, the horsemen,

the Mysians, who fight hand-to-hand, the proud Hippemolgi

who drink mare's milk, and the justice-loving Abii

Αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαινώ] ἀδύνατόν φασιν·

εἰ γὰρ ἀπετράπη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλίου ἐπὶ τὴν Μυσίαν κατὰ τὰ τῆς Ἀσίας

ἔθνη, ἀδύνατον τὴν Θράκην καθορᾶν οὔσαν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ. λύεται δὲ ἐκ

τῆς λέξεως· οὐ γὰρ λέγει τὴν Θράκην αὐτὸν βλέπειν, ἀλλὰ τὴν Θρακῶν

γῆν, ἣς ἦσαν ἄποικοι, κατοικοῦντες δὲ Ἀσίαν, Βιθυνοὶ τε καὶ οἱ Θυνοὶ, (5)

Θρακῶν ἄποικοι.

Porphyry on *Iliad* 13.3: "Zeus himself turned his bright pair of eyes..." They say this cannot be, for if he turned away from Troy and to the Mysians, and to the peoples of Asia, it's impossible he saw Thrace also, since Thrace is in Europe. It can be solved from the words, for Homer isn't saying Zeus saw Thrace, but the land of Thracians who were colonists, and had migrated to Asia, that is, the Bithyni and Thyni, who were Thracian migrants."

#### T11

Schrader, *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem Pertinentas Reliquiae*, Leipzig 1880, p. 49-50 (on *Iliad* 2. 844) "It seems a contradiction to say that "the Thracians, Akamas led, and the hero Peiroos," if (11.221) "Iphidamas, the son of Antenor, strong and great, who was born in Thrace" is also their king. But the solution is in the words; for it wasn't "those round Akamas"

leading *all* the Thracians, especially as he says "those who live upon the Hellespont," so there is room for both Rhesus and Iphidamas to be kings, but over other Thracians, and come to the Trojan's aid later ....

...How can he say that Iphidamas and Rhesus rule the Thracians? But he added "as many as live on the Hellespont." So Akamas led those who lived round Maroneia; Iphidamas others, who came in his "twelve ships," 11.228; and still others, Rhesus led, that is, those around Lydia (Schrader: Thraemer emends to "around Thynia," the Bithynians).

#### T12

Philostratus, *Heroicus* 17 (Aitken-McLean tr., alt.)

*Vinedr.*: [§17.1] You would be wrong to disbelieve, my guest. Since you live near the mainland of Cilicia, perhaps you know more than I do about both Amphiaraios, whom the earth is said to hold in a cleverly devised and secret shrine, and his son Amphilokhos. But you might do injustice to Marôn, the son of Euanthês, who haunts the vines at Ismaros and, by planting and pruning them, makes them produce sweet wine, especially when farmers see Marôn handsome and splendid, exhaling a breath sweet and smelling of wine. You should also know something about the Thracian Rhêsos. Rhêsos, whom Diomedes killed at Troy, is said to inhabit Rhodopê, where they celebrate many of his wonders in song. They say that he still breeds horses, serves as a soldier, and hunts wild beasts. A sign that the hero is hunting is that the wild boars, deer, and all the wild beasts on the mountain come to the altar of Rhêsos by twos or threes to be sacrificed unbound and to offer themselves to the sacrificial knife.[17.5] This same hero is also said to keep

the mountains free of pestilence; thus, Rhodopê is extremely populous, and many villages surround the sanctuary. For this reason I think even Diomedes will cry out in defense of his fellow soldiers. If we believe this Thracian still exists (whom Diomedes killed as one who had done nothing famous at Troy, nor displayed there anything worthy of mention other than his white horses) and we make sacrifices to him while traveling *through Rhodopê and Thrace*, then we would dishonor those who have performed divine and brilliant works, believing the fame surrounding them fabulous tales and idle boasting.

(Mt. Rhodope and other places in Thrace were therefore cult-centers for the worship of Rhesus.)

### T13

Cicero, *de Natura Deorum* 3.45.

Just as by the civil law one whose mother is a freewoman is a freeman, so by the law of nature one whose mother is a goddess must be a god. And in the island of Astypalaea Achilles is most devoutly worshipped by the inhabitants on these grounds; but if Achilles is a god, so are Orpheus and Rhesus, each of whose mother was a Muse, unless perhaps a marriage at the bottom of the sea counts higher than a marriage on dry land! If these are not gods, because they are nowhere worshipped, how can the others be gods?

### T14

Scholion on *Rhesus* 346

(346.) ἡ κεις, ὧ ποταμοῦ παῖς· οὐκ εἴρηκε τίνος Μουσῶν ὁ Ῥῆσος ἦν παῖς. Κλειοῦς μέντοι λέγουσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι, καθάπερ Μαρσύας ὁ νεώτερος ἐν τῷ \* Μακεδονικῶν ιστοριῶν γράφων οὕτως [frg. 6]· ‘εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ περὶ τούτου εἶπον [τοῦτον] Κλειῷ τὴν θεὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Στρυμόνος ἐκ τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν Μουσῶν ἀρπασθεῖσαν νυμφευθῆναι τεκνῶσαί (5) τε τὸν Ῥῆσον· καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγον· ‘ἔστιν ἱερὸν τῆς Κλειοῦς ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει ἰδρυθὲν ἀπέναντι τοῦ Ῥήσου μνημείου ἐπὶ λόφου τινός· ἔνιοι δὲ Εὐτέρπης αὐτὸν γενεαλογοῦσιν, καθάπερ Ἡρακλείδης· φησὶ δὲ· ‘ἐβδόμη δὲ Καλλιόπη, ἢ ποίησιν εὗρε [πάντων καὶ], συνοικήσασα Οἰάγρῳ γεννᾷ Ὀρφέα τὸν πάντων μέγιστον ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῇ κιθαρωδικῇ τέχνῃ γενόμενον. πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μαθήσεως συγκρεματικώτερον· ὀγδόη δ’ Εὐτέρπη, ἣ τὴν κατ’ αὐλοῦ εὔρεν εὐέπειαν, συνοικήσασα Στρυμόνι τεκνοῖ Ῥῆσον ὃς ὑπὸ Ὀδυσσέως καὶ Διομήδους ἀναιρεῖται. οἷς καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐπηκολούθησε γράφων οὕτως· ‘τὰς μὲν Μούσας οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι παρθένους παραδεδώκασιν, ἀναγράφει δὲ Οὐρανίας μὲν Λίνον, (15) Καλλιόπης δὲ, Ὀρφέα, Μελομένης δὲ Θάμυριν, Εὐτέρπης δὲ Ῥῆσον, Τερψιχόρης δὲ Σειρήνας, Κλειοῦς δὲ Ὑμέναιον· τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν Θαλείας Παλαίφατον, ἐκ δὲ Πολυμνίας Τριπτόλεμον. Ἐρατῶ δὲ ἐρασθῆναι μὲν Ὑακίνθου, τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ μηδενός, μηδ’ υἱὸν γενέσθαι αὐτῶν·  
“Thou hast come, O river’s child and the Muse’s” *Rhesus* 346

He does not say of which Muse Rhesus was the child. People say as does Marsyas the Younger, in the Macedonian Histories, writing thus; “but also there are those who on this topic have said that the goddess Clio was snatched up out of the chorus of the Muses and

wedded by the Strymon, and she gave birth to Rhesus” and a little later on “there is a temple of Clio placed in Amphipolis opposite the sepulcher of Rhesus on a certain hill”; and others make him spring from Euterpe, like Heraclides, who says “the seventh Muse is Calliope, the discoverer of poetry, who joined with Oeagrus and bore Orpheus the greatest of all men at the art of the citharode, and also very good at general learning; the eighth Euterpe, who discover the art of singing to the flute, and joined with Strymon bears Rhesus, who was killed by Odysseus and Diomedes; and Apollodorus follows him writing that “the Muses most authors describe as virgins, but it is written that Urania bore Linus, Calliope Orpheus, Melpomene Thamyras, Euterpe Rhesus, Terpsichore the Sirens, Clio Hymenaeus; and among the others, Thalia Palaiphatos, Polyhymnia Triptolemus; and Erato fell in love with Hyacinthus, but nothing came of it and there was no child of theirs.

### T15

Aeschines 2.31

Now the facts about our original acquisition both of the district and of the place called Ennea Hodoi, and the story of the sons of Theseus, one of whom, Acamas, is said to have received this district as the dowry of his wife—all this was fitting to the occasion then, and was given with the utmost exactness, but now, I suppose I must be brief; but those proofs which rested, not on the ancient legends, but on occurrences of our own time, these also I called to mind.

Scholia:

Ἐννέα ὁδῶν] ἡτύχησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐννᾶκις περὶ τὰς Ἐννέα κα-  
λουμένας ὁδοὺς, ὅς ἐστι τόπος τῆς Θράκης, ἡ νῦν καλουμένη Χερ- (5)  
ρόνησος. ἡτύχησαν δὲ διὰ τὰς Φυλλίδος ἀράς, ἥ Δημοφῶντος ἐρα-  
σθεῖσα καὶ προσδοκῶσα αὐτὸν ἐπανήξειν ἀποτελέσοντα τὰς πρὸς  
αὐτὴν συνθήκας καὶ ἐννᾶκις ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ἐλθοῦσα, ὥς οὐχ ἦκε,  
κατηράσατο τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοις τοσαυτάκις ἀτυχῆσαι περὶ τὸν τόπον.  
τὰ δὲ ἀτυχήματα ἐγένοντο τάδε· [τὸ πρῶτον μὲν Λυσιστράτου καὶ (10)  
Λυκούργου καὶ Κρατίνου στρατευόντων ἐπ’ Ἡϊόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυ-  
μονι διεφθάρησαν ὑπὸ Θρακῶν, εἰληφότες Ἡϊόνα, ἐπὶ ἄρ-  
χοντος Ἀθήνησι Φαίδωνος· δεῦτερον οἱ μετὰ Λεάγρου κληροῦχοι.  
ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους· τρίτον οἱ μετ’ Εὐκλέους καὶ Θουκυδίδου· τέ-  
ταρτον οἱ μετὰ Κλέωνος, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου· πέμπτον οἱ ἐνοι- (15)  
κοῦντες Ἡϊόνα Ἀθηναῖοι ἐξηλάθησαν· ἕκτον οἱ μετὰ Σιμίχου  
στρατηγοῦντος διεφθάρησαν· ἑβδομον, ὅτε Πρωτόμαχος ἀπέτυχεν,  
Ἀμφιπολιτῶν αὐτοὺς παραδόντων τοῖς ὁμόροις Θραξίν· ὀγδοον @1  
ἐκπεμφθεῖς ὑπὸ Τιμοθέου Ἀλκίμαχος ἀπέτυχεν, αὐτοῦ παραδόν-  
τος αὐτὸν Θραξίν, ἐπὶ Τιμοκράτους Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντος· ἕνατον (20)  
Τιμόθεος ἐπιστρατεύσας ἡττήθη ἐπὶ Καλλιμῆδους ἄρχοντος.] τὰς  
δὲ Ἐννέα ὁδοὺς Ἀγνων συνοικίσας Ἀθηναῖος ἐκάλεσεν Ἀμφίπολιν,  
ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Εὐθυμένους. τὴν δὲ Φυλλίδα οἱ μὲν Φυλ-  
ληῖδα, οἱ δὲ Κίασαν ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῆς οἱ μὲν  
Φίλανδρον, οἱ δὲ Κίασον, οἱ δὲ Θῆλον, Δημοφῶντι δὲ ἐκ Φυλ- (25)  
λίδος Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ Ἀκάμαντα υἱὸν φασὶ γενέσθαι. Vat. Laur.  
Bgim.

Θησέως παίδων] Θησέως παῖδες Δημοφῶν καὶ Ἀκάμας. τούτων  
Δημοφῶντι λέγεται δοθῆναι προῖκα τὰς ἑννέα ὁδοὺς οὕτω καλου-  
μένας· οὗτος δὲ παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν Ἀκάμαντί φησι δοθῆναι, οὐ (30)  
Δημοφῶντι. Vat. Laur. Bgim.

Ennea Hodoi] The Athenians suffered nine defeats at the Ennea Hodoi, a place in Thrace,  
now called the

the Chersonesus; and their misfortunes came through the curses of Phyllis, who fell in  
love with Demophon, and hoping for his return to fulfill his promises to her came nine  
times to the place;

and because he did not come, cursed the Athenians that they would suffer nine defeats  
there.

And the defeats were (list follows). ...But Hagnon the Athenian renamed the Ennea Hodoi  
Amphipolis when he founded that city, in the archonship of Euthymenes; and Phyllis some  
call Phyllis and others Ciasa, and her father some call Philander, some Ciasos, some  
Thelos; and Demophon they say had from Phyllis (a daughter) Amphipolis and a son  
Acamas.

the children of Theseus] Theseus' sons were Demophon and Acamas. Demophon is said to  
have been given the so-called Ennea Hodoi, as a dowry. Aeschines in contradiction to this  
story says it was Acamas who was given it, not Demophon.

#### T16

Anth. Gr. 7. 705 (Antipater of Sidon)

Στρυμόνι καὶ μεγάλῳ πεπολισμένον Ἑλλησπόντῳ (1)

ἡρίον Ἡδωνῆς Φυλλίδος, Ἀμφίπολι,

λοιπὰ τοι Αἰθοπίης Βραυρωνίδος ἔχνια νηοῦ

μῖναι καὶ ποταμοῦ τὰ μφιμάχητον ὕδωρ·

τὴν δέ ποτ' Αἰγείδαις μεγάλην ἔριν ὥς ἄλιανθ' ἐς

τρῦχος ἐπ' ἀμφοτέραις δερκόμεθ' ἡϊόσιν.

City washed by the Strymon and the great Hellespont,

sepulcher of Edonian Phyllis, O Amphipolis,

of you, only traces of the temple of Aithopia of Brauron,\*

remain, and your river's much-fought-over water;

and the place that was endless strife for the Athenians

we see as rags of purple on either bank.

\*Two of the cult titles of Artemis, "Aithopia" and "Brauronia"

#### T17

Pindar, Paian on the Abderites (first published 1908: POxy. 845)

...O Abderus, armored in bronze, child of the Naiad

Thronia and of Poseidon,

I shall pursue this paian for an Ionian people,

for Apollo Derainos' sake and Aphrodite's... (1-4)

...for I, (Abdera), dwell in this Thracian land, vineyarded and fruitful;

but may long and relentless time not do me damage:

I am a new city: my mother's mother was buried

burnt entirely by enemies' fire: but if a man helping friends  
 is harsh in standing up to enemies,  
 his labor brings peace when done in the right hour...  
 ...A man must give to his parents great share of glory;  
 they who through war obtained a land of fruitfulness,  
 established prosperity, after chasing away,  
 out beyond Athos their divine nurse,  
 the spear-bearing tribes of the Paionians;  
 but then a dreadful fate came on them:  
 yet they persevered, and afterward, the gods joined to fulfill it:  
 (for a man who performs a glorious work  
 is lit up by praises: upon them came  
 a great light against their enemies,  
 before Melamphyllon...)

### T18

Solinus, *Polyhistor* 1.10

10 Abdera, which Diomedes' sister both founded and named after herself, is not far from there. Later it was the home of Democritus, the natural philosopher; and for that reason (to say truth) it is the more renowned. Abdera became decayed with age and was restored to even greater beauty in the 31st Olympiad (c. 654 bc) by the Clazomenians from Asia, who claimed what had gone before, and was obliterated, for their own.

*Translation sponsored in 2018 by Norbert T. Rempe, nephew and godson of Johannes Rempe.*

Norbert T. Rempe  
 1403 N. Country Club Circle  
 Carlsbad, NM 88220  
 USA

575-885-3836  
[rempent@yahoo.com](mailto:rempent@yahoo.com)

Insistence on,  
 and cadaverous compliance with,  
 regulations without continuously  
 questioning and justifying  
 their factual and rational basis  
 is the last refuge of  
 the lazy, incompetent, and malevolent.

"People shall never be enslaved again  
 by the principle that one human being,  
 whether it be a mother or a slave owner,  
 has the right to treat another  
 human life as property"  
 (Alan Keyes on abortion, 1996 presidential campaign)